THE ANTIJACOBIN Review and Magazine,

&c. &c. &c.

For DECEMBER, 1808.

What properly constitutes a virtuous character, is not some few accidental motions of compassion, natural affection, or gratitude, but such a fixed humanity, or *desire*, of the *public good* of all, to whom our influence can extend, as uniformly excites us to all acts of beneficence, according to our utmost prudence and knowledge of the interests of others; and a strong benevolence will not fail to make us careful of informing ourselves right, concerning the truest methods of serving the interests of mankind. HUTCHESON.

Some Account of the Public Life, and a Selection from the unpublished Writings of the Earl of Macartney [*of Earl Macartney*]. *The latter consisting of Extracts from an Account of the Russian Empire; a Sketch of the Political History of Ireland; and a Journal of an Embassy from the King of Great Britain to the Emperor of China; with an Appendix to each Volume.* By John Barrow, F. R. S. Author of "Travels in China," &c. 2 vols. 4to. pages 620, and 531; 3l. 3s. Cadell and Davies.

VITA ipsa, qua fruimur, brevis est, memoriam nostri quam maximè longam efficere: nam divitiarum et formæ gloria fluxa atque fragilis est; virtus clara æternaque habetur, observed the elegant historian of the Cataline war, as the contemplation of great vices, or great virtues, naturally calls forth reflections on the condition of our species. But it has long been a question, what is the best relation in which the historian or biographer can be pleased to sketch the most faithful portrait of his subject? It must be confessed indeed, that a perfect moral likeness is no more practicable than a perfect physical one, for perfection is not the characteristic of any human production. Passions and habits have no less effect on the optics of the moralist or biographical designer, than fancy and peculiar taste have on those of the canvas painter; both add, subtract, or modulate according to their own convenience and dispositions. Since, then, these aberrations are inherent in our nature, it becomes a proper subject of inquiry, by what means may we attain to the smaller gradations of error? The partialities of friendship have been repeatedly urged against biographers, with all the

dogmatism of physical demonstration; but this broad proposition has been laid down with equal indefiniteness and want of truth. Had it indeed been confined to sectarists, who have not only the honour of their deceased friend, but the actual interests of their sect to support, it would have been proper in its extensive sense; but applied to statesmen, it is not only false, but extremely injurious to the discovery of truth, and the diffusion of political knowledge. Who but the most intimate and confidential friend of a statesman can judge of the motives and often irresistible causes of many virtuous and disinterested actions which may appear to the uninformed speculator as atrocious and abominably wicked? Who can detail, if a virtuous man, his various cares, his disappointments, self-denial and disinterested devotion to the general and permanent interests of his country, but some one in whom there existed a mutual friendship? These circumstances, which sufficiently evince the radical distinction which exists between the political and religious biographer, also prove not merely the erroneousness of the above general proposition, but likewise the absolute necessity of having friendly biographers to unfold a true statement of facts to the world. Were we always furnished with such accounts, history (which is nothing but segments of biography, connected with the national chronology of events) would not then be subject to the too well founded reproach of falsehood, as preferred by Walpole.

But, in showing the fallacy of one generally received opinion, it is necessary to avoid establishing another equally erroneous, if not properly limited to its true object. The public advantages of having a friendly and confidential biographer of statesmen, are equally numerous and unquestionable, provided the biographical historian and the politician were men of unequivocal and positive virtue. On the latter limitation depends the justness of the position, for, otherwise, the converse would be true. None but a virtuous friend can do justice to the conduct of a virtuous statesman; for envy, malice, and ignorance, will always detract from the just merits of exalted characters. Yet, if the best interests of society require that friends should pourtray the conduct of virtuous statesmen, the same interests require that vicious ones should be related by their enemies; in both cases it is presumed, the mind of the historian should be inured to virtuous sentiment. The history of a vicious statesman, by his friend, who must necessarily participate in his guilt, could only be a plausible apology addressed to the most dangerous passions of mankind; while that of an opposite character would exhibit nothing but what might become useful examples to society. The virtuous

historian, elevated by his love of truth, seeks only to enlighten and to improve posterity; the vicious bows to the present spectator, to catch the fleeting applause of the moment; the former presents his readers with statements of facts and circumstances which appeal to the understanding, and in some measure compel them to become partially engaged in the passing events; the latter only addresses the imagination by shades which inflame the passions and debase the mind to the level of that of brutes. Hence the necessity of the biographer and historian possessing not only ingenious but also virtuous minds, and hence, too, the propriety of having friendly biographers of virtuous men, and hostile ones of those decidedly vicious; for the former will always find a sufficient number of cynics, and the latter enough of admirers, as the world will never be without some of those perverse spirits, who see humanity in Nero and justice in Buonaparte. The wicked too are always more vicious than even their enemies suppose; the good more virtuous than their friends believe.

The preceding observations render it perfectly unnecessary for us to enter more minutely into the advantages and disadvantages of the relative situation of the author, whose work is now under consideration, and the distinguished subject of his literary labours. Mr. Barrow is certainly well qualified to communicate a just idea of the talents and principles of Lord Macartney, to whom he was many years confidential secretary. The charge of partiality, either from gratitude or friendship, when the moral character of the parties are considered, rather adds than detracts, in our opinion, from the intrinsic merit of these volumes. The author has exhibited in the simple language of truth, the conduct of a man who obeyed his sovereign from the purest attachment, and fulfilled his duty to his country with the strictest justice and the purest zeal. Amidst the conflicts of party, the invidious jealousy of rivals, the intrigues of the ambitious, and the still more atrocious artifices of avaricious and profligate adventurers, we find his lordship always pursuing the same undeviating paths of rectitude, and in the most difficult and arduous situations, evincing such examples of coolness, patience, fortitude, and energy, as can belong only to very superior beings. The fecundity and promptitude of his resources mark his genius; the rectitude, temperance, and sagacity of his measures, evince his practical philosophy. But of this we shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

We must now return to Mr. Barrow, who tells us in his preface, that in this work he has confined himself "rigidly to those events and transactions, in which the subject of the narrative bore a conspicuous part; following him through all the

various situations of his public life, without once losing sight of him, or quitting his company in any of those intricate paths which he frequently had to tread. Being thus furnished with the means of giving a tolerable account of the many difficulties he had to encounter, the firmness with which he always met them, and the wisdom by which he overcame them; I flattered myself with the hope of being able to exhibit an illustrious example of extraordinary self-denial and disinterestedness, of inflexible integrity, unabating zeal, and unrelaxing energy in the public service. It has likewise been my endeavour, in this attempt, to introduce his own sentiments, in his own language, on all occasions, whenever the one or the other, or both, could be adopted without interruption to the narrative; and I have throughout most scrupulously adhered to such documents as were either of a public and official nature, or such as I had unquestionable proof to be of good authority, without hazarding any conjectures of my own, or indeed scarcely venturing to offer a single reflection." This fidelity to the memory and character of his deceased friend, is worthy of the author and his subject, and it proves the good sense of Lord Macartney in selecting a confidential man, whose judgment and discretion would not detract from his high character and talents. The following extract affords matter for much serious reflection.

"In every situation in which he was engaged in the public service, the great and leading features of Lord Macartney's character appear to have been of the same cast; but in narrating the history of his [public] life I have deemed it expedient to dwell at greater length on his government in India, where the powers of his mind had greater scope for action than elsewhere. Here, [there] indeed, his virtues shone forth with transcendent lustre; here [there], *surrounded with intrigue and corruption*, his integrity exposed him to every kind of calumny, his zeal to a hostile opposition, and every measure he took for the detection and reformation of abuse, was pregnant with difficulty, and attended with danger. If, in taking a survey of his public conduct in this [that] quarter of the globe, I have been compelled, from a regard to truth and justice, to state some facts which may seem to bear somewhat hard upon certain individuals, (and to have suppressed them would be little less than treason to the subject of this memoir), I hope, at least, to be believed when I assert, that I entered upon my task free from all prejudice and partiality; that I was in a great degree ignorant of Indian politics, and wholly unacquainted with any of the parties connected with them, except Lord Macartney; that I had no malice to sway me, nor any passion to gratify. I felt, indeed, that it did not belong to me, in my present undertaking, to expose individual corruption, or to drag delinquents to the face of day; that it was not my business to wander from the direct path for the sake of picking up a public offender, though at the same time I do not hesitate to say, that I should *not have felt the least reluctance in exhibiting any character of*

this description that might have fallen directly in my way, Public characters are public property, *and to connive at their abuses is little short of treason to the state.* My object, however, was to show rather, that Lord Macartney acted right, than that others acted wrong; and if, in establishing the rectitude of his conduct, I have unavoidably attached blame to others, I hope to be acquitted, at least, of any malevolent intention. I have been careful to state nothing but what is already on record in India and in Leadenhall-street, and what I conceive there can be no impropriety in making the public acquainted with. Had I on this subject entertained the smallest degree of doubt or hesitation, it would effectually have been removed by a conviction, that Lord Macartney was never averse from publicity being given to every act of his life. In his reply to an application for materials to compose a history of his government in India, by a writer who could have executed the task in a much more able manner than I can pretend to do, he observes, after referring him to the records of the India House, "there is no transaction in my government, even of the minutest nature whatsoever, that I can have any interest or a wish to conceal from the public eye, but it might not be becoming in me to be the channel of communication."

It is much to be regretted that those delinquents to whom Mr. B. alludes, are not publicly exposed, and dragged "to the face of day," and there made to atone to society for their crimes. Many unfortunate criminals annually terminate their existence at the Old Bailey, while numerous and much greater malefactors in India return to England, laden with wealth, wantoning in luxury, and basking in honours, to close their successful career of guilt, by sitting down honourable baronets, or right honourable statesmen! India has been both the tomb and the scourge of British integrity; and all the Englishmen there who were as

"Honest as the nature
Of man first made, ere fraud and vice were fashions,"

have been persecuted by the depravity of their countrymen; a striking instance of this appears in the abuse and calumny heaped upon the upright and disinterested Macartney. But we must return to our subject.

Mr. Barrow, in the present work, has excited rather than gratified expectation, although his situation was so advantageous for acquiring the knowledge necessary to a biographer. He has, indeed, stated his object to be only to give "a faithful sketch of the *public* conduct of a man who had filled various eminent situations in the four quarters of the globe; of one who, with the eye of a statesman and a philosopher, had surveyed mankind in every region and climate of the earth, and who, after a long and laborious life spent in the service of his country, with an

unblemished reputation, resigned it at last, full of years, and crowned with honour, in the midst of his friends, and in the bosom of his family;" as a "sketch of such a life would afford an illustrious example for imitation not unworthy of being handed down to posterity." But of so interesting a character we could have wished for some particulars of his private life also, and especially something more of his family connections. If we agree with Dr. Johnson, that it is the duty of the biographer, to state the name of the tutor of any person of distinguished talents, so it is no less his duty to state the names and character of the family and successors of his subject, as from them much of the genuine character of the principal may be ascertained. Here we are only told, that Earl Macartney, (not Earl of Macartney, for it is the name of the family, and not of a place, as Mr. Barrow seems erroneously to suppose,) was the great grandson of George Macartney, who was a captain of horse, and surveyor-general of Ulster, and who "proclaimed King William and Queen Mary at the head of his troop in Belfast, in 1688." His lordship was born at the family mansion of Lissanoure on the 14th of May, 1737, and died without issue on the 31st of March, 1806, leaving the greater part of his property to Lady Macartney, (one of the Bute family) during her life, and at her death it descends to his niece Elizabeth Hume, whose children are to assume the surname and arms of Macartney.

The author seems not to have known, that a lineal descendent of the same family, we believe, still exists in the Rev. Dr. Macartney of Antrim, a character in talents and virtues, although existing in a more limited sphere, very similar to the late lord. As an enlightened clergyman, and most active and upright magistrate, in the extremely perilous times of sanguinary rebellion, he displayed the most undaunted courage and humanity in preventing the effusion of human blood; and such was even the popular conviction of the goodness of his heart, that it no less than five times arrested the traitorous hand of the assassin, which was raised against his life. His numerous and almost unprecedented escapes, without any regard to the superstitious notion of a particular providence, must at least afford a memorable example of the invulnerability of genuine virtue. His distinguished conduct at that unfortunate period, could not fail to receive the proxy approbation of his sovereign; but as the virtue of rewarding merit, is by no means very common in Ireland, we believe, his only recompense for the skilful and zealous performance of his arduous duties hitherto amounts solely to the pleasing reflection of having rendered important services to his country, as well as to his flock, in saving the

lives of many deluded people, whose gratitude is now an honourable testimony to the rectitude of his character, and justness of his principles. His disinterested benevolence, although the father of a numerous and amiable family, is not less conspicuous than that of the late lord, as many persons who occupy 40 or 50 acres of rich arable land, do not pay him above as many pence for tythe! Such a character is undoubtedly a worthy relative, and should be recorded with the illustrious name of Lord Macartney.

This "Narrative of the Public Life of Lord Macartney," consists of an account of his "Mission to the Court of St. Petersburgh as Envoy Extraordinary;" his "Secretaryship in Ireland;" "Governor of Grenada;" "Governor of Madras;" Negociations and Refusal of the Governor Generalship of Bengal; "Embassy to the Court of Pekin;" "Governor of the Cape of Good Hope;" and his lordship's general character and manners. An Appendix, containing letters from Sir George Macartney while at Petersburgh, and during his governorship of Grenada and Madras, on topics principally relating to political affairs, completes Mr. Barrow's first volume. The second is formed entirely of a selection from the writings of Lord Macartney, or rather from three distinct works, an Account of Russia, an Historical Account of Ireland, and the private journal of his Embassy to China, without any private anecdote or private correspondence, both of which must have been very numerous. Mr. Barrow expresses his decided belief, that those papers will all be laid before the public at some future period, as well as the works from which he has published only abstracts, and we hope that he will not fail in using his best endeavours to expedite their publication, in return for the very flattering reception which these volumes, as well as all his other works, have received.

Lord Macartney, it appears, was placed, when very young, under the tuition of a clergyman named Dennis, whose library consisted of books in theology, and a curious collection of tracts in heraldry, genealogy, and chronology, which young Macartney's thirst for knowledge impelled him to study. To "the early exercise of his memory on those subjects he used to attribute, in a great degree, the peculiar retentive faculty for which through every part of his future life he was distinguished." At the age of thirteen he was admitted a fellow commoner of Trinity College, Dublin, and in 1759 proceeded to master of arts. He then entered the Society of the Middle Temple, where he became acquainted with Mr. Burke, Mr. Dodwell, Mr. Bacon, and others; but not intending to pursue the law as a profession, he made the tour of Europe. On his travels he became ac-

quainted with several young noblemen, and among others with "Mr. Stephen Fox, eldest son of the first, and father of the present Lord Holland," with whose family he continued ever after in habits of intimacy. With the philosopher of Ferney he also entertained a correspondence till his death. On his return, he was introduced to Lord Sandwich, then secretary of state for the northern department; and this led to his first diplomatic essay in Russia, where a cast of the political dice, familiar in that country, had just placed the ingenious and ambitious Catharine on the throne. A treaty of commerce with Russia was then a desideratum with the British ministry, as that of 1734 had expired; and the Empress Elizabeth, notwithstanding the talents of Sir C. H. Williams, the good humour of Mr. Keith, and the splendour of Lord Buckinghamshire, declined renewing it, and Catharine manifested herself completely hostile to the measure. In this state of things Sir George Macartney received the honour of knighthood from his Majesty in October 1764, set out upon his mission, and had his first audience of the empress, as envoy extraordinary from his Britannic Majesty, on the 11th Jan. 1765. He was introduced by M. Panin, the minister for foreign affairs, and confidant of the empress, whom he addressed, after the usual official explanations, in the following terms. "Forgive me, Madam, if I here express my own particular satisfaction in having been chosen for so pleasing, so important an employment. By this means I shall have the happiness of more nearly contemplating those extraordinary accomplishments, those heroic virtues, which make you the delight of that half of the globe over which you reign, and which render you the admiration of the other." This address, added to the beauty of Sir George's person, had the desired effect; and he ultimately succeeded in negociating a commercial treaty, notwithstanding the unaccountable inconsistencies and difficulties occasioned by the English ministry. This treaty has been very generally approved of, as being what all treaties ought to be, mutually advantageous to the contracting parties; but it was suffered to expire without renewal by the late or *petty* administration. It is now very improbable that it will ever be renewed, as the subsequent hostility of Russia has taught us to seek other resources, and to attempt more earnestly to cultivate the articles furnished by that country in our own colonies. The difficulties which Sir George experienced in negociating this treaty, with the obstinacy of M. Panin, and the unforeseen objections started by the British cabinet respecting the mention of the Navigation Act, while they afford a most interesting detail both to ministers

and negociators, evince the zeal and abilities of this distinguished and genuine patriot.

We come now to the next epoch in the life of this statesman, his return from Russia, his subsequent appointment as ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Russian court, his resignation of this appointment, and his disinterested refusal of the ambassador's service of plate, although he had spent 6000*l.* of his own money in Petersburgh. In February 1768 he was married to Lady Jane Stuart, second daughter of the Earl of Bute, became a member for Cockermouth, and the next year was appointed chief secretary of Ireland, under Lord Townshend. It is in this capacity, and by his speeches in the Irish House of Commons, that the talents and wisdom of Sir George Macartney became known; the justice and acuteness of his remarks on the Irish "professors of patriotism," (still a very numerous and very worthless race in that country,) not unfrequently silenced the impetuous declamations of Flood, and rendered the fanatical effusions of the apothecary Lucas ridiculous and laughable. The judicious part of the Irish, have ever sincerely admired and revered his talents and integrity, and the reform which he effected will always be remembered with gratitude by every true friend to his country.

In 1775 Sir George was appointed captain-general and governor in chief of the Caribbee Islands, and in June 1776 was created Lord Macartney, Baron of Lissanoure, in Ireland. When he arrived at Grenada, he found the peace and prosperity of the island considerably obstructed by religious feuds, chiefly between the French and Scotch; the latter detesting the former for being papists, and the former the latter for being intruders. Here, again, his lordship's stern integrity inspired confidence, and his conciliating manners soon effected the establishment of general harmony, and the complete extinction of religious or national animosity. This, however, was no sooner effected, than Grenada, through the culpable negligence of Admirals Young, Barrington, and Byron, particularly the latter, was attacked by a powerful French force, under the *bête* D'Estaing, and obliged to surrender at discretion. The enemy amounted to above 7000 men, whilst Lord Macartney had only 100 soldiers, with a few volunteers and militia, many of whom were French, in all not exceeding 500 persons under arms. They defended themselves most gallantly, and killed and wounded nearly their own number before they surrendered. Lord Macartney, finding that the enemy would not allow him an honourable capitulation, tore the star of the order of the Bath from his breast, observing, "that the ensigns of his sovereign's favour should not grace the trophies of a Frenchman's victory." The French, with their

usual brutality, plundered all his lordship's private property, and seized or destroyed all his papers. D'Estaing also refused him permission to go to any other of the West India islands on his parole of honour, and sent him a close prisoner to France. This was not the sole calamity which his lordship experienced at the same time: the vessel in which Lady Macartney had proposed taking her passage for England was burnt with all her clothes, many of his lordship's papers, and other articles which were dispatched for security on the alarm of the enemy's approach. Lord Macartney received one powerful consolation, indeed, in the public address of thanks from all the principal inhabitants of the island, delivered to him when a prisoner, and even before his brutal conqueror. His defence of the island was no less admired at home; and the British legislature passed an act allowing the import of Grenada sugar, although it was subject to the enemy.

Lord Macartney remained but a very short time prisoner in France; and on his return was solicited by Lord North to undertake a secret and confidential mission to Ireland, which he accomplished equally to the satisfaction of his Majesty's ministers, and Lord Buckingham, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. In 1780 the governorship of Madras becoming vacant, the India company proprietors, friends of Lord Macartney, naturally turned their attention to him, believing that his talents and integrity only were capable of re-establishing the company's affairs in that presidency. Here, however, another difficulty arose; the intriguers and adventurers wished to have a governor chosen from the company's servants, under the specious pretext that local knowledge and experience were necessary to the fulfilment of the duties of that high station. This attempt to confirm, and, as it were, *legalize* corruption, failed; his lordship was appointed president of Fort St. George, and arrived before Pondicherry, after a passage of four months, on the 21st of June 1781. From Vice-Admiral Sir Edward Hughes, the commander in chief of his Majesty's ships on that station, he learned the "intelligence of the war with Hyder Ali, (of which no apprehensions had been entertained in England), the invasion of the Carnatic by this intrepid adventurer, the ill success of our arms, and the general gloomy appearance of our prospects in every part of India." Such a state of things required no less fortitude than ingenuity, both in a military and civil capacity. It raised a dilemma which would have been fatal to many men of some distinction. Yet, strange to say, even the talents and character of Lord Macartney, instead of vanquishing difficulties, served rather to raise them; his appearance, armed with authority to *correct* abuses, was the signal of discord and dis-

obedience among the peculating agents of the company, who were at that time by far the most numerous class of Europeans in India.

The narrative of Lord Macartney's conduct during his presidentship at Madras, necessarily includes the history of Hindostan during the same period, and consequently far exceeds our limits to give even but a slight outline of such multifarious events. In it, however, we have a bird's-eye view of some of the intrigues, peculations, bribery, and corruption of every possible kind, which have disgraced the British name, multiplied wars and devastation, continued the slavery and barbarism of the unfortunate Hindoos, and prepared a mine which sooner or later will ingulf the whole India company. The picture is truly hideous; but on reflecting, that the most vicious persons in those scenes of iniquity have generally passed through life in silence, while many of the more virtuous ones have been the topic of popular clamour, venal calumny, or malignant and invidious invective, it becomes painfully melancholy. The sufferings of an ingenuous and honourable mind, amidst adventurers who would sacrifice every thing that is great or good in society, for the sake of accumulating wealth, may be easier conceived than described. In addition to these, his lordship had the mortification to see the enemies (French and Dutch) triumph on the coast, even in the face of a superior English fleet, which, if properly commanded, could have sent them to the bottom; he also beheld that cruel savage, Hyder Ali, massacre thousands of unresisting and innocent natives in cold blood, while vast numbers of fugitives were expiring with hunger in the streets of Madras. The nabob of Arcot and his family were obliged to take refuge in the town. The numerous cavalry of Hyder Ali had spread all over the Carnatic, and "parties of them approached daily even to the very gates of Madras." The failure of every supply of provisions, except by sea, was accompanied with an increased demand to feed the multitudes which flocked within the walls; and even that supply was rendered precarious by interruptions from the enemy's privateers. No hope of resources could be entertained from any of the princes of India. Their disposition towards the English was avowedly hostile. A general alarm seemed to prevail on account of our supposed ambition, and a suspicion entertained of our ill faith; as well as disrespect arising from the fluctuations of our councils, and the inconsistency of our proceedings." There were indeed strong grounds for believing that a general confederacy was projecting for our expulsion from the Indian peninsula.

Such was the deplorable state of our affairs when Lord Ma-

cartney became president of the council of Madras, and when Sir Edward Hughes with eighteen ships fought the French Admiral Suffren with only sixteen, and suffered him to sheer off without capturing one of them. This same admiral, with more caprice than courage or skill, thought proper to set off to Bengal, and leave the coast unprotected to the ravages of the enemy. Sir Eyre Coote, also, the commander in chief of the army, a brave and skilful officer, possessing a delegated absolute authority, was no less jealous of his superiority; and, whether from the vanity of his fortune in battle, or peevishness arising from bodily infirmities, it required all the address of the governor to flatter and humour him like a child, in order to make him do his duty. The correction of abuses, reforms in the civil administration of the presidency, and the general check which his lordship had given to peculation, could not fail to raise up an host of the most dangerous, because the most unprincipled, enemies. Even his name and character had awakened a vulgar jealousy in the mind of the governor-general of Bengal, Mr. Hastings; and not only governors, generals, agents, and adventurers, but even nabobs, became his most determined opponents. Lord Macartney's disinterestedness only aggravated the malignity of his enemies, as appear by his "*rejection of the highest BRIBE that was probably ever before offered to a governor of Madras in one sum—two lacks of pagodas, or £ 80,000 ! ! !*" (P. 114.)

It would be tedious and disgusting to enter minutely into all the intrigues and double-dealings of Hastings, or the more open rapacity of a Sullivan, a Stuart, and many others; suffice it to say, that all of them combined to vilify and calumniate the inflexible honesty of Lord Macartney. Nay, they even went farther, and intrigued with the nabobs, in order to raise a clamour against his lordship in the British House of Commons. The following sentiments are so deserving of the most attentive consideration of all those who read the reports of debates in parliament, that we give them in the author's own words.

"That a considerable portion of thinking men in the British nation should suffer themselves to be so long and so repeatedly abused, with regard to the complaints of the dependent Mahommedan princes of India, can only be explained by the little trouble that is taken to inform themselves accurately on the subject: but *the enormous sums of money which these intriguing men are always ready to lavish on those who may either be sufficiently ignorant, or sufficiently corrupt, to undertake their cause, will readily account for the zealous advocates which now and then stand forth as their avowed champions;* but the real fact is, that there is not, perhaps, a single individual among these mock princes which the company's servants have erected, who has not violated his engagements with those who raised him to power; and so

base are their characters and conduct in general, that every honest man, who may have had occasion to witness them upon the spot, and whose integrity has been proof against their insidious practices of corruption, must acknowledge, that there is not, perhaps, upon the face of the earth, *a set of creatures so depraved, so worthless, as those dependent upstarts, in whose cause the powers of rhetoric have so frequently been exhausted in the British House of Commons, to rouse and to abuse the generous feelings of the nation.* How few on such occasions have ever believed, that an *English* governor *could be innocent*, when an Indian nabob was his *accuser;* yet how very easy is it for a man, with whom *truth is not considered as a moral obligation, and intrigues and treachery the whole study of his life*, to produce a series of unfounded calumnies; how difficult, at such a distance, to disprove them before the poison has worked its effect. But the time is probably not very distant, when the public, in this respect, will be undeceived; for, as a great moralist has observed, it seldom thinks long on any subject without at last attaining to think right. It is, however, really surprising that, after a lapse of more than half a century, the people of England should still continue to be delighted by every new declaimer, who, *bent upon thrusting himself into notice, and fed upon the bounty of a nabob, impudently* ventures to step forward to *mislead* the public, and to arraign the conduct of those who have really deserved well of their country by a conscientious discharge of their duty. Whoever will give himself the trouble of examining the records of Bengal and Madras, must unavoidably be convinced, that so long as the system is continued of setting up nizams and viziers, nabobs and rajahs, without any real claims or pretensions, as the ostensible governors of countries, provinces, and districts, but in fact mere tools of the company, no governor-general of Bengal, nor president of Madras, provided he be an honest man, can possibly escape their intrigues, their hatred, and their calumny; but if he will allow them to break their engagements with the company, to corrupt their servants, to purchase indulgencies by bribes, to oppress the inhabitants by extortion, cruelty, and murder, and to plunder and encroach upon every petty power that borders on their respective countries, he will be extolled by them as the wisest and best governor that ever ruled in India. Nothing has most assuredly had so strong a tendency to injure the British name among the real and substantial powers of Hindostan, as the impolitic measure of setting up these puppets of authority; and nothing probably would have more influence in consolidating the peace and the prosperity of India, than the abolishing of those double governments, and taking the management of such countries as avowedly belong to the British empire, entirely into our own hands. As a matter of expediency, the company seem now pretty well convinced, that the measure must be adopted; and that those nurseries of oppression, intrigue, and corruption, must be destroyed: millions of unhappy, yet unoffending, natives would then know to whom they were to look up for protection, which, under the present system of things, is, at least, with them a matter of doubt and distress; by discontinuing the erection of dependent nizams, nabobs, rajahs, and khans, the company would get rid of so many

stumbling-blocks to their prosperity, and stepping-stones to their enemies. And better far would it be for them even to double the already large emoluments of their servants, from the highest to the lowest, rather than, out of consideration to their interests, to keep up those phantoms of power with influence and wealth, however sufficient to corrupt their conduct, and feed their avarice. Those who conceive that a government in India, while embarrassed by the intrigues of dependent nabobs and rajahs, is an enviable situation, are little acquainted with the difficulties and dangers with which it is surrounded. To a strictly honest man, bent on doing his duty, a more heart-rending situation can scarcely be imagined; he must either lend the aid of his authority to the most horrid oppressions, cruelties, and murders; or if he resists, incur the charge of oppression himself; thus he treads on thorns at every step, and after years of toil and anxiety for the public welfare, he will retire from the scene with the mortification of finding that all his endeavours have been exhausted in vain to eradicate that system of corruption which is nurtured in every petty court of Hindostan; that he has only drawn upon himself the malignity of those who float within its vortex; and, what is worst of all, he may almost lay his account of meeting at home with the frigid indifference of his employers."

What a number of designing declaimers almost every session start up, some to disguise the means by which they themselves have accumulated wealth in India, and others to open a way to appointments in that country, all of them just knowing enough to discover the weak side of their countrymen's character, and well assured that to excite their passions by fabricated abuses or feigned distress, is the most effectual means of obtaining their object. Sympathy, indeed, as Mr. Barrow observes, would seem to be an affection of the mind, the strength of which increases in proportion to the distance of the exciting cause. Distant distress has the advantage arising from the powers of imagination to operate in its favour; hence the supposed sufferings of a Mohammedan khan or a Hindoo rajah are able to dissolve the hearts of the whole nation, while objects of real distress at home, from their want of novelty, and the embellishments of fancy, are contemplated with comparative unconcern. A tale of distress well represented is capable sometimes of exciting a kind of sensation that renders almost unwelcome the conviction of its falsehood; it is one of those pleasing errors which, as Dr. Johnson observed, is not always *willingly* detected. Nay, so great is this infatuation, that we have recently seen, under the specious pretext of *humanity*, the most atrocious falsehoods eagerly credited, although resting on no other authority than that of swindlers, prostitutes, robbers, runaways, and traitors, supported indeed by the gold of some intriguant.

[To be continued.]

Little Odes to Great Folks; with a dedicatory Dithyrambic to Sir R-ch-rd Ph-ll-ps, Knight. By Pindar Minimus. With Notes critical and explanatory, by Sextus Scriblerus. 8vo. p. 107. Oddy, 1808.

SOME months have elapsed since the poets of the day sung forth the virtues of "*All the Talents*," or, indeed, of any portion of them; and as the old adage saith, "we cannot have too much of a good thing," we are decidedly of opinion, that Mr. Pindar *the less* has performed an acceptable service to the public, by employing his muse on so profitable a subject. But he has still greater merit than his renowned predecessor; for he has blended the talents of the city with those of the court, and so endeavoured to gratify all the lovers of talents, from St. James's to the Mansion House. We could have wished, indeed, that his Pegasus had stopped awhile to bait at the corner of *Bridge-street*, as he might there have found a fine subject for another ode, and have celebrated, with becoming fire, the Talents of the Guildhall Patriot, not fine Irish, but "Dowlass, filthy Dowlas," who bawls for *reform*, and daily advertises for *contraband goods.*—*Verbum sat.*—If he avail himself of this hint, we shall then, perhaps, be encouraged to give him a few more, and to suggest to him the propriety of visiting the *Whig Club*, which will supply him with abundance of materials for odes, satires, or epithalamiums.

The "Little Odes" are eight in number, and the "Great Folks" to whom they are addressed, are; 1. Sir Richard Phillips, Knight; 2. The Right Honourable Samuel Whitbread, M. P.; 3. Mr. William Roscoe; 4. *the family* of the Grenvilles; 5. Lord Stanhope; 6. The Reverend Doctor Randolph of Bath; 7. Lord Grey; 8. The Marquis of Douglass. Of these odes, for the information of our readers, we state, that the first seven are *dithyrambic*, and the last is *elegiac*; and to them are, very appropriately subjoined or superadded, an Epithalamium on Lord and Lady Petty. We have already observed, that the poet has not confined himself to the court end of the town; and, indeed, we should have said, that the town itself is too narrow a boundary to circumscribe the flights of his aspiring muse; for she has even extended her excursions to Bath and Liverpool: his impartiality, thus displayed, cannot be too loudly commended; and that we may not be behind hand with him in this laudable quality, nor be supposed to labour under any *town* prejudice, we shall extract, as specimens of the poet's abilities, the two *country* odes, to Mr. Roscoe, and Dr. Randolph.

"A Friendly Admonitory Ode to Mr. W. Rosc-e, late twelvemonths M. P. for L-v-rp-ol."

"Argument.—The Poet condoleth on his loss, and adviseth temperance—pathetically lamenteth the fall of the Talents, and dissuadeth his friend William from pamphleteering—maketh a simile, and compareth William to a wiseacre—declareth his respect for grave historians—and hinteth at the proper horse for such to ride—adviseth his friend to take an airing with his nurse—concludeth with a friendly admonition.

"ODE.

"Dear William, tho' you've lost your seat*,
Pray keep your temper, if you can—
Revenge, I know, is very sweet,
But suits it with your Christian plan†?

Besides, I own, I'm much in doubt,
Whether for vengeance this the hour;
Your friends, alas! are all shut out
From popularity and pow'r!

And tho' you shed much gall and ink,
And brandish high your grey-goose pen,
"The Talents" all begin to think,
You ne'er can write them *in* again.

Had you not better, my dear Billy,
Cease to perplex your honest brains,
Lest wicked wags should say you're silly,
To take your labour for your pains?

Ill luck betide the day you quitted
Hist'ry, and ran a pamphleteering‡!

---

* "When "The Talents" got into power, thinking that Mr. R's talent had hitherto been hid in a napkin, they resolved to set it up in high places, and so made him into an M. P. When seated in the House of Commons, Mr. R. seemed to form his conduct on that wise saying of the Greeks;

"Καχως ακουειν κρεισσον ἠ λεγειν καχως,"

or, as our worthy English forefathers expressed it;

"The least said is soonest mended."

For the speeches that Mr. R. did *not* make, see Parliamentary Register, *passim*. For his speeches *intended* to have been spoken, consult *Chaucer-Godwin's* Life of him (to be written and published some years hence,) in which you will doubtless be told both what he did not say, and what he *might have said*. S. S.

† "Of what sect of the Christian religion Mr. R. is a member, I never heard. He dresses like a *Quaker*, talks like a *Methodist*, and writes like a *Muggletonian*. S. S.

‡ "Mr. R. who had hitherto been known to the world as a worthy, pains-taking compiler of history, no sooner found himself shut out of Parliament, than he began to turn his attention seriously to politics. In order to take as comprehensive a view as possible of public affairs, he retired to a small village in Lancashire. There he made a vast

A race for which you're little fitted,
  Witness the world's confounded jeering!

So have I seen a greybeard trying
  To back a mettlesome young filly,
But 'midst her flirting and high-flying,
  Look rather shy and rather silly:

Till having lost his seat a-straddle,—
  His stirrups gone,—his bridle breaking,—
He quits the honours of the saddle,
  In a mud ditch his safety seeking:

Then whooping, hallooing, how the boys
  Run to the spot to see poor master,—
With their loud laughter and curs'd noise,
  Making much worse the dire disaster.

Take thou a hint, dear William do,—
The case just suiting you know who.
I would not, I, for any "Considerations,"
See grave historians in such situations.

Stick still to your old hackney mare
  Of Hist'ry, an please 'e;—
Her jog-trot suits 'e to a hair—
  She carries safe and easy.

Or if a frolic fancy hit,—
  Without much danger or much trouble,
Behind *Nurse Tansiello* you may sit—
  Your Peg will safely carry double.

---

survey of the Continent, and, like Friar Bacon's head of brass, spoke of time past, present, and to come. In a critical hour, his aweful "Considerations" made their appearance in public. The friends of the Talents triumphed. The work, as Mr. Fox said of Sir Philip Francis' speech, was *unanswerable*—that is, as Mr. Fox himself explained his own meaning, "until it was answered." Serious thoughts were entertained in the higher circles, that Mr. R.'s force of argument must drive the present ministers from their places—the ministers themselves were in a sweat—when lo! *Master William Cobbett* stept forth, and audaciously dared to prove that *Master William R-sc-e* had told only a pack of fibs, and deserved nothing better than a whipping for his pains. Altho' he had pledged his credit that Napoleon is a very good tempered, obliging, little gentleman, nobody would believe him. The ungrateful world fell a laughing to see the grave historian "perplexed in the extreme," and the ministers began to congratulate themselves that what they had at first mistaken for a lion, turned out an animal of a less terrific description. Mr. R. is said to have published another political *work*, which I have not seen. But I am told, that as a politician, his writings are *semper idem*,—that is, as *Swift* translated it, "worse and worse." *Ah! le pauvre homme.* S.S.

She ambles prettily, I vow—
Aye—you are on the right horse now.
In namby-pamby verse,
Let Nurse*,
Teach ladies to their lords so dear,
"To suckle fools, and chronicle small beer."
But skittish politics, dear Billy, shun
For ever:
O! never
Be made again the wicked sport of fun."

If Mr. Roscoe will but hear advice, he will bid adieu to politics; and if he must write, ransack Italy for subjects. Before we extract the next ode, we must enter our protest against profane attacks upon sacred characters. *Ludere cum sacris*, is highly unbecoming a lyric poet; besides, if we once indulge in such a propensity, there is no saying where it may lead us;—poets who begin with a mere *sprig of divinity* may end with an *archiepiscopal trunk*.

"ODE to the Rev. DOCTOR R-ND-LPH of B**h.

"ARGUMENT.—The poet evinceth his acquaintance with classical learning, and modestly extolleth Doctor R——'s excellence in letter writing—commendeth his topics and his style—condoleth on his banishment, and pathetically painteth his unhappy fate—describeth his disorder, and the mode of relief—commemorateth an immortal pair—pointeth out a noble subject for biography—hinteth at the effects of envy and spleen, in preventing preferment, and asketh a question well worthy the attention of our ecclesiastical elders—concludeth with a hint.

"ODE.

"Ye antiquated Ciceros and Plinys—
Ye Senecas, and such like pagan ninnies;—
All ye, who wrote so many silly letters,
"Hide your diminish'd heads" before your silly betters!
For epistolary writing,
Doctor R-nd-lph is the man!
Look at those of his inditing—†
Show his equal if you can.

"* "The Nurse," a poem, translated from the Italian of *Tansiello*, by Mr. W-ll-am R-sc-e.

"† The Doctor, a very worthy man, tho' no conjuror, lately published what he called "A Few Observations on the State of the Nation," addressed in a letter to the Duke of B-df-rd. It is therein declared, that we are in the last stage of a mortal distemper, but ("laud we the Gods") the Doctor has a panacea in his pocket;—

Politics he sweetly blends
With his feelings for his friends;
To his dear country, and "dear Lord,"
He gives alternately a word;
Now mourns the one,—the other praises,—
By turns our grief and wonder raises!
Then for a metaphor, I vow,
There never was his like 'till now.
In ev'ry page a new one rises,
And this delights, and that surprises;
From trope to trope still see him flying—
He cuts a dash, there's no denying;
Thro' sim'les thick and thin while hopping,
You'd think he ne'er intended stopping;
And, when he stops, you're sure to find
The lazy meaning lagging far behind.

"But ah! his sorrows who shall tell,
Exil'd from Ireland, lov'd so well!
Sent back to Bath—oh! what a pity—
Banish'd from Dublin's noble city.
Bath delights him now no more,—
E'en Laura* looks not as before;—†

---

nothing less than the paying off the national debt by a general contribution,—the same scheme proposed some years ago by the Bishop of Landaff. To this there can be but one possible objection—that the patient would inevitably be choked, in attempting to swallow the nostrum. Five hundred and fifty millions of money to be immediately raised! Bravo! The Doctor may well exclaim *Ευρηκα*:—if he can remove the debt in the way he speaks of, Archimedes was but a baby in comparison, who boasted that he could move our earth, if —he had another to put his foot upon. The Doctor very pathetically deplores the late change of ministry, particularly on account of poor dear Ireland, whither, it seems, he went as chaplain to the Duke; and if he and his Grace had stayed but a little longer, nobody can tell what good they might have done. An Irish bishopric might have chanced to have fallen vacant, and then "*Nolo episcopari*," construed according to the most approved version, and "*Ego et Rex meus*," I and my Lord Duke——Alas! good man, when all thy honours were a ripening, to come a nipping frost! S. S.

"*Laura Chapel, where the reverend Doctor, by dint of good lungs and an animated gesticulation, used to preach his congregation into a heat, even in the depth of winter, and vigorously prevented their falling into the arms of Morpheus, notwithstanding the seductions of easy cushions and patent stoves. S. S.

"† Our Poet here beautifully paraphrases the motto to the Doctor's Epistle—"*Nam plerisque mutatis, ea quoque mutata videntur quæ manent,*—" which literally *done into English*, would run thus: "For the Ministry being changed, and 'my dear Lord' no longer

Her cushion now he coldly thumps,
And drawls his text out, in the dumps;—
No longer rouses with emotion
His hearers' hearts to warm devotion,
But leaves the stoves to fill each seat
With equable religious heat.
Thro' the Pump-room, lo! he wanders,
And on Dublin Castle ponders.
With step disorder'd see him walking,
With accents dismal hear him talking,
He lists the fiddles,—takes a glass
Of water,—and then lets it pass;—
But nought his fond regrets can e'er abate,
Or soothe the sorrows of his hapless fate!
His soul, surcharg'd with "observation,"
Requires a quick evacuation;—
His pen with ink and words runs o'er,—
He fills a sheet, then calls for more;
Discharging from his aching head
All he has ever heard or read;
He twists, he turns, he strives, he strains,
To ease the load upon his brains;
Then in a flood of figures vents
On his "dear Lord" their whole contents!
The Duke and Doctor—worthy pair!—
Our equal admiration share;
'Tis difficult to say which is,
Of the dear twain, the greatest quiz*.

"O R-nd-lph! fail not to record
Each deed and word of your "dear Lord;"
That at some future, distant day,
When Britain mourns him dead,
The world in wire-wove quarto may
Know all he did and said.

"Then will each reader, in amazement crost,
Exclaim—"Oh! what a statesman† there was lost!"

Lieutenant of Ireland, my prospects of preferment seem changed also." S. S.

"* "Vir *bonus* est *quis*."

"† His Grace's "Talents," as a Statesman, are too well known to need illustration from my pen. Whether he be as excellent a judge of sheep and oxen as his late brother, I feel myself incompetent to decide. The Doctor's Epistle was written to him during a Tour in the Highlands, whither he went, I am informed, for the express purpose of having ocular demonstration of the mode of foddering cattle, in use among that sharp-sighted people. Some persons have affected surprise that the Doctor did not accompany his "dear Lord" in this excursion, as well as to Dublin. But they do not consider

While thou, a *patriot* true, shalt think with pain,
On such a *patron* ne'er to look again,
It must, I'm sure, be envy's work, or spleen,
That thou, dear Doctor, art not yet a Dean:
And where, I beg to know, can our Church fish up
A Doctor fitter to be made a Bishop* ?

" But if preferment's path you take†,
Dear Doctor take a hint;—
Long letters for your " dear Lord's" sake,
Still write—but do not print‡.

This muse has a very uncivil *memory*; though, in good truth, if it be exercised only for the purpose of dissuading the *elegant* doctor from indulging himself in the epistolary theme, we shall

---

the difference of climate, and that the shrewd, biting air of the Highlands, where there is not a single deanery or episcopal palace to shelter one from the inclement weather, might very ill have agreed with the reverend Chaplain's constitution. Let us be thankful that the Duke took so far a journey, in order to enable the Doctor to write so long a letter; and that, while his Grace was making profound observations on the agriculture of the Hebrides, his chaplain was making observations no less profound on the politics of Europe. —S. S.

" * It was said by Bishop *Warburton* of Dean *Tucker*, that he was too good a Politician to make a good Divine. Doctor R-nd lph need fear no such rebuke from the Bishop of Bath and Wells; his Epistle is a satisfactory proof that he is laudably ignorant on all those topics that come not within the province of a Doctor of Divinity. S.S.

" † Since writing a preceding note, I have been told by those who know the Doctor best, that no member of the Established Church can have a more constitutional antipathy than he has to a mitre and lawn sleeves; and that, were he obliged, in deference to higher authority, to accept them, the melancholy consequence would probably be, an inquest of *felo de se*, or *non compos*. Of this temperament were many holy men among the primitive Christians. Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, relates that Evagrius ran away for fear of a bishopric, and that Ammonius cut off one of his ears to render himself incapable of it. H. E. l. iv. c. 23. At the present day, it might perhaps sound rather oddly, to read in the B-th paper, that "On —— last, the Reverend Doctor R—— was found by one of the ver " gers, hanging from the Episcopal stall of —— Cathedral. The " cause of the rash act is said to have been a *Conge d'Elire* lately is- " sued." S. S.

" ‡ Perhaps our Poet's advice may not be much amiss. If I remember right, this is the Doctor's *second* exploit in the epistolary line. Has he forgotten the old say ng ?—

Tempora mutantur————
————*litera scripta manet.*

S. S.

not wish to impose a curb on it. Never surely was a man so unfortunate in his letters, at this Bath Theologian;—the Princess of Wales's letters returned by a stage coach, to fall into Lady Jersey's hands!! But we will forbear, in the hope that the Doctor will write no more letters. As a parting admonition, we will observe, that a non-resident clergyman should be cautious in his pulpit Philippics on non-residence—that a beneficed clergyman in the country should not pass one half of the year in frequenting places of fashionable resort, or in great towns; and that a good *parish priest* is a much more respectable character than any *popular preacher*.

Hints on the Economy of feeding Stock, and bettering the Condition of the Poor. By J. C. Curwen, Esq. M. P. of Workington-Hall, Cumberland. P. 382, 8vo. with five plates, 10s. Crosby and Co. London; Jollie, Hodgson, Carlisle; Bowness, Workington, &c. 1808.

THE late injudicious efforts of the agriculturists, to resist the sugar distillation, have excited serious reflections, which are highly disadvantageous to their character. If men are so ignorant or so weak as not to see the propriety of such a measure at the present period, or if they are servile and mean enough to flatter the worst passions of their constituents, at the expense of their own judgment and integrity, they must naturally expect to sink under the contempt of the better part of their countrymen. As legislators, their conduct was in the highest degree culpable and unworthy of independent Englishmen; as agriculturists, it evinced want of foresight, and illiberal selfishness; and as men it was equally unjust, irrational, and inhuman. What confidence, it will be asked, can the public now place in the statements of a Young, Sinclair, and others, after witnessing the absurdity of their calculations of the value of flour during the last summer? Certainly not less than they deserve. We trust, therefore, that such a signal exposure will teach the more enlightened agriculturists to beware of such delusions in future, and that they will again bear in mind, that all such sinister efforts not only degrade themselves, but do an incalculable injury to the very cause which they mean to support. Such works, however, as the interesting volume before us, will contribute to rescue, at least, some of the professors of agriculture from any permanent reproach, provided they do not interfere with party politics.

Mr. Curwen, with equal propriety and truth, dedicates this collection of his various communications to the Board of Agriculture, or Prize Essays on the Economical Feeding of Horses

and Cattle, to the worthy Bishop of Landaff, whose useful labours and example first gave an impulse to such meritorious pursuits. The first paper in this volume details the author's experiments and final establishment of "the steaming of potatoes as a substitute for hay," that is, boiling potatoes by steam, and giving them in that state, mixed with cut straw and hay, in equal quantities, to horses. After seven years experience, Mr Curwen can recommend this food as greatly preferable to hay and straw alone. The agricultural advantages, he calculates, would be, that a horse will annually consume the hay on three acres of land, while he can be better supported by the potatoes which grow on half an acre, leaving $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres to produce food for man. In the vicinity of large towns, where both potatoes and fuel are dear, the profits of this method would be much less considerable, unless in certain situations where steam engines for other purposes were established. Two stone of hay are given to a horse each day; the allowance of oats to colliery horses is 12 lb. a day, farm-horses 8 lb. and cart-horses 10 lb. Mr. Curwen has substituted 5 lb. of carrots for 4 lb. of oats, and this has kept his horses in better health and spirits than with the full allowance of oats. The following is his "estimate of feeding a farm-horse per day: $1\frac{1}{2}$ stone of potatoes, at 3d. per stone $4\frac{1}{2}$d.; 7 lb. of cut straw and labour, 2d. steaming, $\frac{1}{2}$d.; 7 lb. of straw, 1d.; 8 lb. of oats, at 3s. 6d. per Winchester bushel, weighing from 40 to 44 lbs. 8d; total, 1s. 4d." For a colliery horse, which is equivalent to a London cart-horse, 1 stone of potatoes 3d. steaming, $\frac{1}{4}$d.; 9 lb. of hay, at 6d. per stone, and cutting, $\frac{1}{4}$d. $4\frac{1}{4}$d.; 7 lb. of straw, 1d.; 12 lb. of oats, 1s.; total, 1s. 8d. per day, or 24l. 6s. 8d. a year for farm-horses, and 30l. 8s. 4d. for colliery or cart-horses. The cost of the apparatus and steaming-house, potatoe-washer, tubs, boiler, pumps, and building, was originally only 102l. but must now be estimated at 120l. so that 10l. a year should be added to the above expense; this, however, is to be divided among 100 horses, which a steaming-house on such a scale is capable of daily supplying, or 120 stone per day. Potatoes "lost by steaming an eightieth [we presume an eighth] part, by roasting a sixth," without admitting of the benefits of mixing with cut straw, and bruised oats. Drawings of all the different apparatus for these purposes illustrate this interesting paper, which may convey much practical information, even to those who keep but a few horses, as potatoes and carrots are found to be more nutritious and salutary to them than either hay or straw.

The second paper in these Hints, is entitled, "On the Means

of supplying Milk for the Poor;" but a very small part of it is confined to this laudable object, the author having indulged himself in digressing to almost every subject connected with agriculture, corn and poor laws. As his remarks are generally judicious, and founded on actual experience, we are not disposed to murmur at their irregularity, although they would certainly have lost nothing either in simplicity or utility by a more natural and clear arrangement. We shall endeavour, however, to notice the principal facts. The first object of our author's benevolent intention, was to supply the populous town of Workington with a winter dairy, affording an adequate supply of milk for the daily use of the poor. His cows were fed with green food, as being so much cheaper than hay, and for this purpose he planted cabbages and turnips. The produce was about 35½ tons of cabbages per acre, some of which weighed 55 lb. The common drumhead cabbage were first used; next followed the common turnip, then the Swedish and kohlrabi, and last the coleseed. The latter he found the most productive of milk; and it has the additional advantage of standing till the end of May, when lucerne is fit for cutting. The cost of feeding milch cows was 4 stone of the above green food, 4d.; 4 lb. of oil-cake, 4d., and 8 lb. of straw, 1d.;=9d. a day. The new milk sold for 2d. a wine quart, the skim milk 1d. The profits of the farmer on the green crop of 22 acres were 101l. 10s.; those of the milkman (on 22 cows) and feeder, for wintering stock, were 133l. 19s. 6d. which, when united in the same person, gave a net return of 235l. 9s. 6d. This sum, under better management, Mr. C. thinks, should amount to 300l. from which rent and taxes are to be deducted. This, it must be confessed, is a very ample profit, where so small a capital was employed, and one which should teach the farmers in the vicinity of London to attempt the adoption of a similar system.

"The advantages of feeding with green crops," observes Mr. C. "are the saving of rent, and the profits of a great stock upon a little ground. Some deduction from this may be stated for the additional buildings which would be required for stall-feeding and soiling; but this would be trifling, and bear no proportion to the returns it might fairly be expected to make, and the rents which would be consequently given in consideration of these conveniencies. I should suppose that green crops, upon a comparative scale of feeding with hay, may be stated as seven to one. Potatoes and carrots, &c. will exceed this, and both these crops have the advantage of being conveyed by water-carriage from districts where rents are from 15s. to 20s. per acre, to places where 5l. or 6l are paid, and labour proportionably high. Summer soiling in comparison with grazing, will equal, if not exceed the proportion of ten to one, besides the almost incalculable advantage of preserving the manure, and having the stock in better condition, and less liable

to accidents. The profits on carrots, which are so good for horses, are also considerable; an acre will produce 2000 stone at 6d. per stone, which amounts to 50l. besides the tops. Thus, in this manner, a saving of 60 acres of land, in a farm of 600, in the feeding of cattle alone, opens a wide field for speculation. The retrenchment of a tenth, with a gain to the public of the means, if applied to the growth of corn, of supporting in bread 180 persons, cannot fail of calling forth serious reflections, and challenging attention to the important advantages which might be drawn from the general adoption of this system The extension of grain crops would likewise introduce, in an equal proportion, the growth of clover, by which the produce of summer food would be quadrupled. Supposing England and Wales to contain 48 millions of acres, and that 21 of these are under pasture for horses and cattle, I conceive a million and a half of acres might be taken from the lands in pasture, and brought under rotative crops, in aid of what is so applied at present."

If the author's estimates are correct, of which we see no reason to doubt, the general adoption of his system would furnish sustenance for three millions of people more than the existing methods. His plan, however, of supplying milk to the working people, is not less politically and physically advantageous than benevolent. If pure milk were generally substituted, especially for children, instead of beer, we should no longer hear of such great mortality in large cities, or manufacturing towns. Indeed, if all our labourers could be induced to use milk more frequently, their health and strength, and consequently their ability to labour, would be very considerably increased. This measure is now the more desirable, that, thanks to the malignity of our enemies, the policy of common sense begins to prevail, and we are no longer doomed to use a foreign, expensive, and debilitating vegetable (tea), instead of a nutritious and salutary one (coffee), the produce of our own colonies. The folly of depending on a distant and inhospitable country, for one of the primary necessaries of life, and for which nothing but gold was taken in exchange, will scarcely be credited in less than half a century. Would those who now consume malt liquor at their meals adopt the use of coffee, they would soon experience the beneficial change in their general health and constitution, and the grain now used for malt could be much more beneficially appropriated to bread, and the feeding of cattle for milk. Human ingenuity, perhaps, has not hitherto discovered any simple compound fluid at once so agreeable, and so salutary, as that composed of one half coffee, and one half milk, what the French call *café au lait.* That this, or simple coffee, will be adopted by great numbers instead of malt liquor, cannot be doubted. The great majority of the people of England at present, in all the towns,

consume a quart of porter daily, which amounts to 91 gallons in the year, containing above 180 grains of opium or other powerful narcotics, which, if formed into a mass, would be sufficient to poison above 20 persons: the difference in the expense of a pint of coffee and a pint of malt liquor, would add materially to the income of the consumer. We hope, therefore, the people of the united kingdom, who are unquestionably the most rational of any in the habitable globe, will consider and profit by their experience on this subject; we are the more sanguine in this respect, that they are not likely to be misled by any delusive sentiment of supposed liberality or humanity in such an affair.

In recommending, however, the reforms proposed by our author, in the economy of food for man and beast, let it not be supposed that these are all the improvements which could be instantly and conveniently made: there is yet another much greater and more simple, which should be adopted in the manufacture of bread. The French, who are not only the greatest epicures, but also the greatest gormands, have had recourse to artificial means to ferment their bread, in order to render it more soluble in their soups and other liquids; we have imitated them in this respect without having the same necessity, and ferment our bread to such an excess as to lose the most essential part of it. From a great variety of experiments on flour of different countries, we have found that a pound of good flour generally contains

oz. 14	amylaceous matter,
1	gluten, or vegeto-animal substance,
0¼	sugar,
0¾	insoluble fecula,
16	ounces.

Now in the process of fermentation both gluten and sugar are destroyed, which are the two most nutritious parts of the flour. Supposing, then, that each individual in London consumes a loaf of fermented bread every week, which is considerably under the average, and that every loaf loses by fermentation five ounces, or only a quarter of a pound, the annual loss of nutritious matter in the bread of each person would be 26lbs. or six weeks allowance. If the population of London be taken at the lowest calculation of one million, thus at least twenty-six millions of pounds of this vegeto-animal substance is annually lost. As this loss is of the most nutritious matter, it is equal to three and one-quarter million stones of meat, worth 800,000l. allowing that each individual in London annually consumes

245lbs. of meat; and if it is estimated according to the system of Pringle, that one pound of animal food contains as much nutriment as twelve pounds of vegetable, it is equal to the annual loss of three hundred and twelve million pounds of bread. Comparing, however, bread to meat as four to one, which is pretty near the fact, almost one-fourth of the nutriment of flour is lost by fermentation. This is no visionary speculation founded on any abstract theory, as we have physical demonstration of the advantages of unfermented bread in the superior health and strength of our seamen, who are for years accustomed to nothing but hard dry biscuit. These facts show what very simple means are yet within our power to increase the quantity of food for our increasing population, without having recourse to the anti-social plans of Malthus. Abandon the use of fermented bread, and the same quantity of flour now consumed will support equally well at least one-ninth more than the present population. The loss of bread by fermentation will also enable our author to explain more satisfactorily why two and one-half acres of land formerly were amply sufficient for the support of a labourer, when five and one-half will barely suffice to furnish him at the present day with the various articles of food and *liquor*. When luxury and affected delicacy were less general, when the use of fermented bread was confined to the large towns, and only to the higher classes in those towns, and when the greater part of the wheat appropriated to bread was ground only into meal, which was mixed with that of peas, beans, or barley, and used by all the working people in solid bread, without being deprived of its sugar and gluten, then indeed might a much less quantity of land furnish nutriment for each individual. The accumulated population of great towns, the increase of large manufactories, and the almost universal use of animal food, may have contributed, as Mr. C. concludes, to increase the consumption in a greater proportion than the population has increased; but the augmented and still augmenting waste of bread-corn, is the most serious and efficient evil in the economy of aliment. There is scarcely a day-labourer or plough-boy in England who does not now eat his *wheaten loaf* and tea for his breakfast, to the great injury of his own health and strength, and the prejudice of his family. The increased use of animal food, if our author's system were adopted, would be much less injurious to the agricultural product than he himself supposes. The daily consumption of food of animals, is generally estimated in proportion to their weight, as one-third to two-fifths. Sheep consume daily about a fifth, small cattle about a fourth of their weight. Leicester sheep have gained a pound on every

sixty-four pounds of turnips; others a pound on every eighty-one pounds consumed. Cattle, in grazing, gain three hundred and seventy-eight pounds on an acre, while sheep gain only two hundred and sixteen pounds. These estimates, however, are far from being accurately established; but they are sufficient to show that grazing is more advantageous to the farmer than the growing of corn; and when it is remembered that premiums have been given on the importation of wheat, it must be evident that they acted as bounties to the grazier.

Among the numerous judicious remarks which abound in this volume, there are perhaps none which deserve more attention than those on horses. Mr. Curwen estimates the number of pleasure horses at 200,000, which require the produce of six acres to each; 30,000 cavalry, requiring five acres; a million of draught and husbandry horses, requiring four acres each; and 200,000 colts and brood mares, at three acres; making a total of 1,430,000 horses *, which consume the produce of nearly six millions of acres. In order to remedy this vast consumption by horses, he proposes that two of these six millions of acres should be appropriated to oats, and that by substituting potatoes, carrots, and straw, a saving of 300,000 acres might be effected. A reduction of the number of horses kept for pleasure and waggons he considers as highly laudable, and recommends the adoption of iron-rail roads, where there is a great transport of goods. In addition to this he concludes, that if there are now twenty millions of acres in pasture, besides those used by horses, the feeding of milk-cows, and fattening cattle with green food summer and winter, would effect a reduction of at least a sixteenth, and that consequently 1,200,000 acres might be appropriated to the culture of wheat. The application of capital to this purpose, he thinks, would be much more permanently advantageous than to commerce, although, he justly believes, that our staple commodities, such as salt, iron, coals, tin, lead, copper, &c. which cannot be found elsewhere, will support our trade in defiance of all the efforts of the enemy. We cannot, however, accede to his axiom, that a "nation of agriculturists will be considerably more populous than a manufacturing one, unless they place their reliance for food on foreign countries, in which case they must be a dependent people." We are surprised that Mr. C. and other enlightened agriculturists, do not perceive that the

* Middleton, in his Survey of Middlesex estimates the number of horses in South Britain at 1,800,000, which he calculates to consume only the product of 3,600,000 acres. We think Mr. Curwen's estimate of six acres to each pleasure horse must be greatly overrated.

cultivation of land, or the feeding of cattle, is as much a manufacture as carding, spinning, and weaving wool or cotton. Neither is it true that simple agricultural people are ever very numerous; it is not consonant with the usual progress of the human mind to remain long in that state. The spirit of traffic manifests itself even among savage tribes at a very early period; it is connected with chance or fortune, which the human heart is ever anticipating. The possibility of rapidly accumulating great wealth captivates the imagination, makes men merchants, and they make manufacturers, whose ingenious labours excite curiosity, disseminate science, and tend to civilise and comfort distant nations. The adventures of the merchant increase and continue fortunate until all nations have attained a certain level or equality; then, indeed, he can no longer hope to gain an independence by the profits of a single adventure, but must expect them to be as circumscribed, and as definite, as those of the manufacturer, mechanic, or agriculturist. This is the period when agricultural speculations commence, when those in commerce and manufactures have attained their climax, and when the riches acquired by trade have contributed to diffuse learning and knowledge among nations, and when men's minds are sufficiently enlightened to pursue the slow but certain means of acquiring wealth by the cultivation of the soil. Thus nations become wealthy by commerce, by wealth they soon grow learned and populous, and when populous they necessarily become agricultural; but whenever they cease to be wealthy, their science, their population, and their agriculture soon decline, and they again sink into vice, ignorance, and insignificance. There is no populous country which has not previously been commercial and wealthy; nor is there any wealthy country which will not become agricultural. We have attained our commercial era; we are approaching our agricultural one: a little attention to this fact might have prevented several writers the labour of composing many ponderous volumes. So true it is, as our author has subsequently admitted, that our "agricultural and commercial interests are so united, that they must stand or fall together; to restore and maintain an equal balance between them appears most conducive to our national prosperity." On this principle he "contends that the landed interest had ultimately more to apprehend from the high prices of grain than the manufacturer; and that any material fluctuation of price does more immediately affect its interests. As agricultural wages are regulated in a great measure by the price of the prime necessaries of life, the late high prices of grain advanced wages 40 per cent. which, notwith-

standing the years of plenty that succeeded, it has not been found practicable to reduce. The labourer's scale of expense has kept pace with his wages; various other articles have also advanced, and he is as little able as ever to provide against any additional pressure; so that should an advance take place in grain above the standard of common years (and his employer refuse a still further increase of wages), his family must have recourse to parochial relief, which ultimately brings a heavy burden upon the landholder." These considerations should induce the farmer to resist to the utmost the monopoly of the corn factors, who suffer nothing by the distresses of the poor, as they have not to pay heavy poor-rates. It should also be remembered, that the ruinous system of lowering the price of grain by bounties on importation, rather aggravates than alleviates the evil; for if 1000 quarters of wheat are imported and sold for 4l. a quarter, and on which 1l. a quarter bounty is paid, is it not sufficiently evident that this wheat virtually costs the consumer 5l. a quarter? The bounty must be raised by taxes —and all taxation must ultimately fall on labour. In addition to this, if such wheat has been imported from America, it comes in American bottoms, and neither our ship-owners nor our merchants make a farthing by the trade, the whole profits of which pass directly into the hands of the enemy.

Leaving, however, the author's general speculations, which evince considerable experience, good sense, benevolence, and patriotism, to return to his experiments in producing milk, he states, as a necessary preliminary, that he found the disagreeable taste in cream and butter, from feeding the cows on green food, effectually prevented by saturating warm water with saltpetre, then boiling it till all the scum which rises to the surface shall be disengaged and removed, when it is cooled, strained, and bottled for use; on setting the milk, two spoonfuls of this solution of saltpetre were added to every six or eight quarts. Mr. C. states the whole expenses and profits both on the green food for the milk cows, and on the milk which they produced, very fully. One of his friends, Mr. Bower of Keswick, had 425 quarts of entire milk, of which fourteen were strippings, from five cows in a week; this yielded in cream forty-nine quarts, strippings fourteen; and blue milk 393=456 quarts, being an increase of thirty-one quarts, or as eighteen to seventeen. This increase of volume, which can be accounted for only by the absorption of oxygen in the separation of the cream from the blue milk, sufficiently explains the nature and extent of the profits of persons who in London buy new milk in order to sell the cream of it.

The remaining papers in this volume treat of "Soiling

Cattle," which is a counterpart of the paper on supplying the poor with milk; "General Hints on Farming," including some judicious and interesting observations for "Farming by Gentlemen," in which Mr. C. states his own essay and experiments; on "Draining," "System," "Cleaning of Land," "Seeds and Weeds," "Accounts and Experiments," "Labour and Workmen," "Manures," in which the author, we think, justly disapproves of the practice of fermenting dung and making of dunghills, instead of putting it deep into the earth. "Early Sowing" is also wisely recommended: but the most important paper, because the most authoritative, is the urgent recommendation to grant leases to farmers. On this head Mr. C. speaks both as a farmer and land-owner, and considers leases to be indisputably the true interest of both; in this, we believe, almost every well-informed person in the united kingdom will concur. The "Jealousy of Farmers," "Returns—economy," "Workington Agricultural Society," and the culture of "Potatoes," are also considered and accompanied with some useful remarks. The last and most laborious paper in these Hints, is devoted to the subject of "Friendly Societies;" here the author's benevolence is eminently conspicuous, and his zeal for the welfare of his working people and tenantry is equally honourable to him as a man and a true friend to his country. The numerous friendly societies which he and his good lady have instituted among both sexes at Workington, and in the collieries, are here copiously detailed, as well as their beneficial effects in diminishing the poor-rates, improving the morals, and reviving the ancient spirit of independence in the labouring people. Would country gentlemen patronise such institutions among their dependents, as Mr. Curwen has done, we might then hope to see the enormous poor-rates sink to their former insignificance, and what is nearly of equal importance, expect a race of country squires from among whom upright and unambitious legislators could be chosen.

We have noticed some errors in the author's calculations as well as in his style, but we do not think them of any serious importance to the positions he wishes to establish. In recommending method to farmers, he ought, however, to have given them a better example of method in his own work, which is in every other respect so worthy their earnest attention, and also that of all noblemen and gentlemen who wish to support the true dignity of their country by contributing to its internal happiness.

An Examination of the Article in the Antijacobin Review, for November, January, February, and March last, upon the Substance of Sir John C. Hippisley's Additional Observations, &c. on the Catholic Question, in four Letters to a Gentleman of Dublin. By the Rev. J. Milner, D. D. F. S. A.

THIS pamphlet, printed in London, the 12th of April last, was written in defence of one composed by Sir John C. Hippisley, which was printed, but not published, and which the Honourable Baronet has been circulating with uncommon diligence, having presented copies of it, not only to individuals, but to some public libraries*.

We should not have noticed it, but that the main object of its author appears to be, that of recommending and panegyrizing popery, that deadly enemy of pure religion and rational liberty, and which often aimed at the subversion of our constitution in church and state. The public may form an opinion of the understanding and knowledge of a person, who with much gravity endeavours to prove, that the tenets of popery are as good as those of the established church, and as well calculated to promote moral harmony and social order under our state, and that protestants have been as sanguinary, and practised persecution as much as the votaries of the Holy See, when, respectively, they enjoyed an ascendancy.

This he attempts to accomplish, merely on the assurances of some popish priests, of whom Dr. Milner is one, and whom he states to be *the highest living authorities*, without quoting any writer of veracity, ancient or modern, to substantiate any of his assertions. But were the Hon Baronet to interrogate the members of the Corresponding Society, the Catholic Committee, or the United Irishmen, as to the designs and the principles of their respective bodies, we will venture to assert that they would praise them as much as these reverend gentlemen have the doctrines of their church.

On the assurances of the latter, Sir John C. H. goes so far as to assert, that excommunication, confession†, absolution and infallibility, are nearly the same, and not different in their effects, in both churches, and that the dispensing and deposing doctrines were as strongly urged by the early reformists, as by any of the Roman Pontiffs.

* In like manner the Doctor's pamphlet has not been published, but he has been zealous in circulating it.

† What an unfortunate situation a popish priest is placed in, when in the confession box! If he conceals treason revealed to him, he is guilty of misprision of treason, and of sacrilege if he reveals it, as confession is a sacrament in the Romish church.

On perusing Sir John C. Hippisley's pamphlet, we were convinced that the leading positions in it were obtained from Doctor Milner, not only because similar ones are to be found in his History of Winchester, and in his Ecclesiastical Democracy Detected; but because the Honourable Baronet frequently panegyrises him, boasts of his intimacy, and calls him his loyal friend, and the Doctor repays him, with an abundance of flattery. He even goes so far, in p. 50, as to defend his "Case of Conscience solved," written by his pious and learned preceptor. Sir John says, in p. 48, "the bull of Pius V. never was received or considered as binding on the consciences of the Queen's (Elizabeth's) catholic subjects. It was founded on no principle of doctrine, or admissible principle of the Romish church. The Queen's catholic subjects defended her person and throne, and the thunders of the Vatican were spent in air." "Gregory XIIIth, his successor, expressly declared it was not binding on the English catholics." Doctor Milner in p. 248 of his Ecclesiastical Democracy, says: "For I have demonstrated, that the whole catholic body adhered to their allegiance, and that the Jesuits and seminary priests, no less than those of Mary's reign, on the scaffold itself, acknowledged the Queen's titles, in opposition to the bull of Pius V. which relating to *a civil concern**, they were at liberty to disobey; and that even their instructions from Rome itself were, not to concern themselves with this or with any political affair." In p. 193 of this work, the Doctor says the same, and "that at the request of Allen and the first Jesuits, the bull was virtually recalled by the succeeding pontiff, Gregory XIII."

Of the various treasonable conspiracies and assassination-plots, which were produced by that bull against the government and the life of that princess, we shall adduce but the following, to prove how egregiously the Honourable Baronet has been deceived by his pious preceptor.

Pius V. published this bull against Elizabeth in the year 1569, in which he excommunicated her, declared her title to the crown void, and absolved her subjects from their oaths of allegiance†. We defy Dr. Milner, or his disciple, to prove, that this pope sent any instructions to his votaries, in order to abate the treasonable and sanguinary orders contained in that bull, or requiring them not to interfere in any political concern. On the contrary, we shall incontestibly demonstrate, from the

* We request the reader will observe, that Dr. M. declares excommunicating the Queen, pronouncing her deposed, absolving her subjects from their allegiance, and invoking them to rise in arms against her, *a civil concern*.

† Camden, p. 427.

writers of this pope's life*, that he studiously endeavoured, as soon as he was seated in the pontifical chair, to have her *deposed and murdered*. In the year 1568, he persuaded one Roberto Ridolphi†, a Florentine by birth, who had lived some years in London, as a merchant, to stir up the English papists to rebel against the Queen, for the purpose of propagating the popish religion. He also promised to defray the expenses of the war, and advanced him‡ one hundred thousand crowns for promoting that design. All this was done before any papist had been called in question on account of religion, since her accession to the throne§. This was confirmed by Bzovius‖ their champion, who acknowledged, that no persons suffered during her reign, but those who maintained the pope's power to depose kings. Next year, viz. 1569, the better to effect his designs, he sent Nicholas Morton¶, D. D. into England, to fan the flame of rebellion, which was on the point of breaking out, and for that purpose to absolve her subjects from their allegiance, and to denounce her as an excommunicated heretic.

This negociation had the desired effect; for the same year a dreadful rebellion was raised by the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, at the head of 600 horse and 4000 infantry‖‖, and who declared that the object of their rising was the restoring the religion of their ancestors, and the removal of evil counsellors. The two earls having by letters announced to the pope the zeal with which they were proceeding to propagate their religion, he, elate at the intelligence, publicly declared, that, *if necessary, he would go in person to assist in the rebellion, and would in that service engage all the goods of the apostolic see*‖§. Thuanus, a Roman catholic historian‖†, of great veracity, acknowledges that long before this, Pius V. had been secretly plotting against Elizabeth; but finding that all his malignant schemes, hitherto conducted with secrecy, had been discovered, he the same year, boldly and without disguise, published his famous bull, *Damnatio et Excommunicatio Elizæ*; and a desperate fanatic of the name of Felton, posted it up at the Bishop of London's

---

* De medio tollere cogitab. Anto. Gubutius Vita Pii V. lib. 3, c. 9.

† Camden, p. 146; Udall's History of Mary Queen of Scotland, p. 119 and 69; V. Girolamo Catona Vita del Pio V. p. 113.

‡ Secular Priests important Considerations, London, 1675, p. 57, V. G. Catena, p. 116.

§ Idem, p, 53.

‖ Abr. Bzovius, de Rom. Pontif. c. 46, p. 621.

¶ Sanders de Visib. Eccl. Monarch. Wittinburgi, 1592, p. 706.

‖‖ Catona, p. 115. ‖§ Id. p. 116, Foulis, p. 427.

‖† Chapter 46.

palace, for which he suffered capitally. When brought to his trial, he avowed this nefarious action, defended it as meritorious, and embraced the crown of martyrdom, for which he appears to have had a violent ambition. He suffered in the 12th year of her reign; and as he is the first pious martyr* whom the Romish pretended martyrologists put down as having devoted his life for the good of the holy catholic faith, the reader may deduce from it the mildness of the government in their proceedings against popish traitors and rebels.

While the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland were in open rebellion, Pius V. wrote them a letter †, to encourage them to persevere, dated the 20th of February, 1570. In p. 288 of our 28th volume, we gave a copious extract from that epistle, which completely refutes Doctor M.'s assertions that the English papists opposed the bull, and that they *received instructions from Rome itself, not to interfere with any political concern.* In the same page of that volume we also proved, that Gregory XIII. instead of denying that the bull of his predecessor Pius V. was binding on the English catholics, virtually confirmed it, by granting them a dispensation for a rigid observance of it; but he granted it only till they were powerful enough to rise and rebel against her ‡. Besides, he issued a bull dated the 13th of May, 1580, in substance the same as that published by Pius V. addressed to the Queen's Irish subjects. In 1571 the Duke of Norfolk entered into a new conspiracy, for which he suffered. This, and a former one, in which he engaged, were made in concert with the Duke of Alva, the Spanish governor of the Low Countries, and were to have been supported by an invasion from that quarter. Alva was at that time exercising dreadful cruelties in these provinces, by which he drove their inhabitants into rebellion; and when he quitted that government in 1579, he boasted that he had delivered eighteen thousand heretics into the hands of the executioner. The execrable massacre at Paris took place in 1572; and it appeared that the great catholic powers of Europe had entered into a conspiracy for extirpating the protestant religion§; and as Elizabeth was regarded at that time as the bulwark of it, she was the peculiar object of their enmity. Throckmorton's conspiracy,

---

* Foulis's Hist. p. 418.

† Pio V. Epist. Apost. p. 290. Antwerp. 1640, ex officina Plantiniana, ed. F. Gaubou. It is remarkable, that in this letter *he bids them imitate the example of (that early rebel) Thomas a Becket, and neither for menace or dangers to desist.*

‡ Speed, 871.

§ Davila, lib. iii. p. 163. Lond. ed.

concerted with Spain, was discovered in 1584; and Parry's against the Queen's life in 1585. This last was encouraged by Palmio a Jesuit, Campeggio a nuncio, Como a cardinal, and pope Gregory XIII.* Babington's conspiracy against the Queen's life took place in 1586. John Payne†, a priest, formed a conspiracy to assassinate the Queen, in which he was to have been assisted by fifty bravoes. Speed observes on this, "These and such are the men that are made martyrs on the pope's bead-roll." Great numbers of Jesuits and other missionaries were constantly sent into England, to inspire the Queen's subjects with detestation of her as a heretic, devoted to perdition, and to encourage them to execute the papal sentence against her.

In 1588, Philip equipped his invincible armada, and Sextus V. seconded the enterprise with all his spiritual authority. He renewed the bulls of Pius V. and Gregory XIII. against Elizabeth: he excommunicated her, dethroned her, absolved her subjects from their allegiance, published a crusade against her, and granted plenary indulgence to all those who should contribute to its success‡. Although pope Clement VIII. published another bull against her, in the year 1600, of much the same tenor, and though the popes, his predecessors, issued a great number of them, from the 11th to the 17th century, tending to promote treason and rebellion, assassinations and massacres, of which we gave many instances in p. 282 of our 28th volume, Sir John C. H. in p. 48 of his pamphlet, says of the bull of Pius V., "*it was merely the assumption of an intemperate and misjudging individual*, acted upon the animosity of the Queen's inveterate enemy, the King of Spain."

The Doctor, in page 181 of his Ecclesiastical Democracy, says thus of Queen Elizabeth: "as the celebrated Camden, who

---

* Speed, page 873.

† Idem, page 871. The Pope's absolution was found on his person.

‡ Doctor Milner, in his History of Winchester, Vol. ii. note I. p. 387, assures us, that "the body of the English catholics, instead of receiving the papal bull of excommunication and dethronement, positively rejected it. They knew how to acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the bishop of Rome, without ascribing to him one *atom of temporal authority*." In page 17 of his defence of Sir John C. H.'s pamphlet, Dr. Milner says: "No subjects of any other description ever displayed such firm and heroic loyalty, as the British catholics did, during the whole of Elizabeth's reign; particularly at her taking possession of the throne, at Northumberland's revolt, at the publication of the bull, and when the nation was threatened by the Spanish armada."

wrote the history of her life, remarks, she was made sensible at the beginning of her reign, that it was all over with her, if the power of the pope who had twice decided on the illegitimacy of her birth, was admitted to remain in any shape whatsoever:" and this the Doctor observes was the reason of her having the oath of supremacy passed. Independent of the conduct of the popes for some centuries, in denouncing and raising rebellions against sovereign princes, who did not acknowledge their supremacy, she had a strong proof of what she was to expect from the holy see. Paul IV. at that time filled the pontifical chair, who, as Father Paul tells us, "never talked to ambassadors, without thundering in their ears, that he was superior to all princes; that he would admit none of them to a footing of familiarity with him; that it was in his power to change kingdoms; and that he was successor of those who deposed kings and emperors." Con. Trent, lib. v. p. 384. When her ambassador notified her accession to this furious old pontiff, he told him, "that England was a fief of the holy see, that being illegitimate, she could not inherit it; that it was an act of high audacity in her, to assume the title and government without his consent; that he could not annul the decisions of Clement VII. and Paul III. on that subject: that she did not deserve any regard from him to her pretensions; but that if she renounced them, and submitted her case entirely to him, he would do every thing that could be done, consistently with the dignity of the apostolic see." Ibid. lib. v. p. 398. On this Elizabeth recalled her ambassador, and, without regarding this arrogant pontiff, proceeded to settle her government.

Doctor Milner, in p. 178 of his Ecclesiastical Democracy, Detected, speaks thus of the traitors who suffered for high treason in Elizabeth's reign, "*those holy men, no less than constant martyrs, whom catholics, in every part of the church, have looked upon with such high veneration*;" and in p. 184 he calls them, "*saint-like personages.*" In p. 185 of the same, he speaks thus of them and the government who punished them: "It is true, that their *persecutors*, in imitation of the apostate Julian, used all their artifices to obscure the cause of these martyrs' death, by alleging that they suffered not on account of their religion, but for treason." He then subjoins the following blasphemous note, indicating, that those traitors, like the primitive Christians, suffered for *the sake of their redeemer*. "Hoc unum apostata studet, vim facere, et fuisse videri nolle—ut qui Christo moriebantur, tanquam facinerosi pluti et puniri videntur." St. Greg. Nazi. contra Jul.

We shall show the reader the grounds on which Doctor

Milner palliates the guilt, and justifies the conduct of the traitors under Elizabeth's government. By the general councils and canon law of the Romish church, the prostration of heresy, and the extermination of heretics, are recommended as a religious duty, on all occasions, to catholics, and therefore, he says, in p. 197 of his Ecclesiastical Democracy, "to overturn the religion which Christ is supposed to have established, and which the country has adapted, is one of those causes *which justifies resistance on the part of the subject, and authorises the pastors to declare in favour of such resistance.*" This position evidently defends every rebellion which has been raised against every state in Europe, which was so fortunate as to emancipate itself from popery, which the Doctor, in many parts of his History of Winchester, and his Ecclesiastical Democracy, considers as *the religion of Christ;* particularly as he asserts, in p. 97 of the latter, "that the pope has a right of addressing his doctrinal instructions and ecclesiastical mandates to every portion of the church," by which all the rebellions against protestant states have been raised, and that the said mandates "*are to be received as coming from Christ himself**." Here the loyal friend, and learned preceptor of Sir J. C. H. speaks his real sentiments.

As to the dutiful obedience or resistance of the English catholics to the Queen's government, after the bull of Pius V. it appears by Dr. Milner's own statement, that it rested solely on the will of the holy see; for he explicitly acknowledges in p. 199 of his Ecclesiastical Democracy, that "the whole difference is, that the catholics of those times, instead of deciding for themselves, on so important and *conscientious a business*, as protestants in general claimed a right to do, only then judged the right lawful, when an impartial and equitable arbiter, their ecclesiastical superior (the pope) decided that it was so, as Cardinal Allen argues in his answer to Cecil †."

Thus in the dreadful rebellion which Hugh O'Neil, Earl of Tyrone, had raised in Ireland against Elizabeth's government, on the ground of religion, Sir George Carew, lord president of Munster, tells us, that the Irish papists "had perfect liberty of conscience, and a free exercise of their religion, but were still discontented, unless it were supreme under the Romish

---

* In the same page the Doctor maintains, in the fullest manner, the *innerrancy*, or infallibility of the pope.

† Thus it appears that the protestants claimed a right to decide for themselves, but the loyalty of the catholics depended on the decision of the pope, who had absolved them from their allegiance, and denounced the Queen as a deposed heretic.

authority." "And what kind of subjection can be expected at the hands of such papists may appear, for that some of great quality in Munster, did about the middle of this month purposely send certain priests to Rome, to purchase absolution from the pope, for the sin they had committed, in not entering into public hostility with the rest; and because they saw that the Queen could not be violently dispossessed of Ireland, did likewise entreat a *dispensation from overt action*, but yet to live unchangeably in the catholic religion, and to be permitted *in outward temporary obedience*, her Majesty's subjects. Consider, therefore, I say, the dutiful obedience of these men, *whose obedience depends upon the pope's power**."

Fynes Moryson, at the same time, secretary to the viceroy, Lord Mountjoy, tells us in his Itinerary, that many persons who submitted themselves to the government on the success of the English forces, "yet sent to Rome for dispensations for having done so†." Dr. Milner asks the following question in p. 41 of this pamphlet, written in defence of his disciple. Did not Cecil, Lord Burleigh, publish a book in the reign of Elizabeth, to justify the putting of catholics to death for their religion? It was quite the contrary, and the Doctor cannot but know it. As many traitors who fled, or were banished to the continent for treason, had falsely said, that they and their fellow religionists had been persecuted on account of their being catholics, Lord Burleigh published a tract entitled, "The Execution of Justice in England, not for Religion, but for Treason," in which their false assertions were completely refuted.

Another proof of the Doctor's disregard to historic truth is this; in page 245 of his Ecclesiastical Democracy, he says, "The fact is, that since the bull of Pius V. which being of a *political nature*, the catholics refused to accept, and which was withdrawn at Rome itself soon after its publication, no pope, or other ecclesiastical superior, has ever interfered in the civil and political affairs of the catholics, any further than to recommend to them a peaceable, submissive, and respectable behaviour to the established government‡." It has been

* Hibernia Pacata, written by Sir George Carew, p. 81, folio edition.

† Itinerary, p. 94, folio edition. None of them submitted till the English government, after a long and destructive war, had a decided superiority. During the rebellion of 1641, they sent the titular bishop of Ferns, and Sir Nicholas Plunket, as ambassadors to the pope, to assure his holiness, that they would not consent to any terms with the government, without his consent.

‡ He observes in a note, "I have heard catholics of name and fortune acknowledge, that they were indebted to the advice of the

already shown, that three damnatory bulls were issued against the Queen, by the successors of Pius V. viz. Gregory XIII. Sextus V. and Clement VIII. After the diabolical conspiracy of the gunpowder plot was discovered and defeated, an oath of allegiance was framed, to provide against such horrible machinations; on which pope Paul V. issued two bulls, in which, under pain of damnation, he ordered the oath not to be taken.

In the reign of Charles I. an. dom. 1626, Urban VIII. exhorted the Irish by a bull, to lose their lives, sooner than submit to the wicked and pestilent oath of supremacy, by which the sceptre of the catholic church was wrested from the vicar of God Almighty; and yet such blasphemy had the desired effect, in kindling disaffection in the ignorant and superstitious multitude. While the dreadful rebellion of 1641, raised by Romish ecclesiastics, continued to rage, the same pope issued a bull, dated the 25th of May, 1643, the better to inflame his votaries, in which he desires them, "in imitation of their godly and worthy ancestors, to endeavour, by force, to deliver their thralled nation from the oppressions and grievous injuries of *the heretics*, wherewith this long time it hath been afflicted, and heavily burthened, and gallantly to do what in them lieth, *to extirpate, and totally root out those workers of iniquity*;" and in this he offers plenary indulgence, and full remission of sins, to such persons as would join in that pious crusade. That rebellion was continued many years, by the mandatory orders and epistles of the same pope, and by the busy and intriguing spirit of Rinuceini his nuncio, a turbulent and sanguinary fanatic, whom he sent to Ireland, for the purpose of inflaming the popish multitude, and of dissuading them from acknowledging and submitting to the government of *an heretical sovereign*. The Doctor, in page ii. of his pamphlet, says, "few could have entered upon the discussion of the (catholic) subject, with such eminent advantages of information, connected with the doctrine, discipline, character, and situation of catholics, as the worthy baronet possesses*." We gave abundant proofs of the contrary in our 28th and 29th volumes, and we hope, that what we shall state in these strictures, will evince his ignorance therein, and that he has been most egregiously deceived by his pious preceptor.

---

late bishop Challoner for the preservation of their lives and estates in 1745." This proves their disaffection, and that their peaceable conduct depended solely on the advice of their spiritual guides.

* This is a very grateful and suitable return to his disciple Sir John C. H., for the warm encomiums which he lavished on his pious preceptor.

Doctor Milner, with his usual disingenousness and disregard to truth, asserts, in p. 4, that we said, "that an honourable member of Parliament has been bribed by a popish committee, constantly sitting in Dublin, with large sums of money, raised on their body." We asserted quite the contrary; for having stated that certain persons, whose names we mentioned, were paid by that committee, to write in support of their claims, and that they were actuated by sinister motives, we explicitly declared, that "we were far from imputing such to Sir John C. H." In the same page, 268, we explicitly declared, "that we were unwilling to ascribe his intemperate zeal (for popery) to unworthy motives." How dare Doctor Milner, who *ought to be* the minister of truth, thus openly assert a wilful and deliberate falsehood! what credit, after this, can the arrogant priest, who professes all the bigotry, credulity, and impudence of the popish advocates of the dark ages, expect from a British public, or even from the honest part of the Romish inhabitants of this protestant isle?

The whole of his pamphlet, in defence of his disciple Sir John C. H., consists of unfounded assumptions, in which he advances the most obvious untruths, and denies facts which have been substantiated by the best historical documents. What hopes of success can an honest and upright impugner of popish frauds and errors, entertain in a controversy with an adversary, who, in the true spirit of his church, appears to consider that the *end* justifies the *means*?

The Doctor says, after praising the knowledge and learning of Sir John C. H., that the following benevolent and patriotic motive led him to write his pamphlet. "*The measure of a substantial and cordial union of interest and affection, among the component parts of the British empire, being recommended by* Sir John *(in perfect unison with the catholic act of* 1793*) as tending to consolidate its strength and measures**. The Antijacobin denies this self-evident doctrine, and cites the peevish language of Lord Clare (who had been himself a catholic,) in commendation of the old system of division and coercion." We defy Sir John C. Hippisley to produce a single instance, where papists were contented to live subordinate to, or even on the same footing, in the exercise of political power, with protestants. Every attempt in Ireland to conciliate the former, has only produced treasonable machinations and disturbances. The very extensive concessions granted to the Irish papists in the beginning of 1793, were immediately followed by nocturnal robbery and assassination, perpetrated in most parts of

* These are the words of his disciple Sir John C. H.

Ireland, by a popish banditti called Defenders, who often attacked the king's troops without any provocation at noon day; and these dreadful scenes of anarchy continued to increase till the explosion of the rebellion in 1798. The Defenders are thus described in the report of the secret committee of the House of Lords, published in 1793. "That they were all of the Roman catholic persuasion, that they assembled mostly in the night, and forced into the houses of protestants, and deprived them of their arms*: that their measures were concerted and conducted with the utmost secrecy, and a degree of regularity and system, not usual in persons of such mean condition." It then unequivocally states, "that they were guided and protected by the catholic committee," that sums of money to a considerable amount were raised on their body at large, by subscriptions and collections at their chapels and elsewhere, under the authority of a printed circular letter, signed by the secretary of the said committee, and that arms and ammunition to a large amount were purchased by them. They were so terrific that year, *the æra of their grand emancipation*, that Lord Westmoreland declared in his speech to both houses of Parliament, on the 16th of August, 1793, that "the spirit of discontent which prevailed among the lower order of the people, at the beginning of this session, has since burst into acts of riot and insurrection, so that I have been under the painful necessity of employing his Majesty's forces, whose steadiness and good conduct have on all occasions been manifested." That year they often attacked, and had severe conflicts with the king's troops. Such were the blessed effects of attempting to conciliate the Irish papists! Among various untruths stated by Doctor Milner, he says, that Lord Clare had been a catholic; which all those that knew him can contradict. In like manner, after uttering the grossest scurrility, and the most bitter invectives against Doctor Duigenan, in his Tour through Ireland, he says, that his father was for some time a convert from popery, and that he afterwards became a relapsed papist, and died such: that the doctor himself was bred a papist, and became a convert. The latter went to the diocesan school of Dublin at a very early period of his life, with the present bishop of Ossory, Sir Michael Smith, late Master of the Rolls in Ireland, and the Rev. Doctor Ledwich, author of the Antiquities of Ireland; and we appeal to them for the truth of the following facts—whether Doctor Duigenan was not, from the earliest period of his life, a member of the established church,

* This practice has prevailed for many months, in those counties which petitioned last session for catholic emancipation, and in which there are now alarming disturbances.

whether they were not cotemporaries with him in the university of Dublin, of which, for his abilities and literary merit, he was chosen a fellow, and by degrees became a senior fellow thereof; which situation, in rank, dignity, and emolument, is not inferior to a canonry of Christ Church, Oxford. We appeal to the same persons, whether his father was not a protestant and a constant churchman, and whether he was not at his death a member of the established church.

What can Doctor Milner mean, by the *old system of division and coercion*. We again assert, and we defy him to prove the contrary, that no penal laws were enacted against the Irish papists till after the revolution, and yet they manifested deep-rooted treason and disaffection to the protestant state, for more than a century and a half previous to that period. The penal laws then enacted made them tolerably peaceable and obedient, but ever since their repeal, they have been as disaffected, turbulent, and rebellious, as they were before their enactment. History and experience should be the only guide to statesmen. History is philosophy teaching wisdom by experience; and if we have recourse to the annals of every protestant state in Europe, we shall find, that the conduct of the Romanists have been uniformly the same. As to the events of Ireland in Elizabeth's reign, we shall refer our readers to p. 20 of our 27th volume; for those of James I. to p. 124 of the same; for those of Charles I. to p. 231 of the same; for those of Charles II. to p. 428 of vol. 18, and for a faithful relation of the disgraceful events which occurred in Ireland after the abdication of James II., when the Irish papists, possessed exclusively of all political power, endeavoured to exterminate all the protestants, and to separate their native country from England, we shall refer our readers to p. 230 of our 26th volume*.

In p. 8 Doctor Milner says, "the Antijacobin now attempts to open upon Sir John Hippisley, the old spiked battery of the general councils, in order to prove against him, that catholics are bound by their religion, to murder all Christians of a different belief from themselves †." He then proceeds to gloss over, and to palliate the impious doctrines of these councils, particularly those of the 4th Lateran; and he pretends that the

---

* During the reigns of all these monarchs, they solicited the aid of the enemies of the empire, to accomplish these purposes.

† We have already proved in p. 272 of our 28th volume, that some of the general councils prescribe this as an indispensable duty, and we shall now prove that Dr. Milner applauds these councils, and insists on their validity; and so do Dr. Troy, Francis Plowden, and his brother, the priest.

sanguinary part thereof, viz. the third canon, "*was a mere temporary regulation of discipline, and of no force in countries where it was not received, as it never was in these islands**." "In this respect, it was essentially different from the first and second canons of the same council, which having the faith of the church, that is to say, *truth*, for their object, are of universal obligation." Now we shall quote the Doctor himself, to refute what he thus asserts.

In p. 97 of his Ecclesiastical Democracy, he says, in his defence of the pope's universal supremacy, "But to appeal to a still more clear, as well as certain authority, I mean the *unerring voice of the whole church, delivered in her general councils*, I ask, whether *the fourth council of Lateran*, called, *by way of distinction, the Great Council*, has not decided, that the Roman church, *by the ordinance of God*, has the supremacy of ordinary power †. I ask whether other general councils have not held the same language ‡, and, in particular, whether that of Florence has not decided, "that the Roman pontiff has *received full power from Christ to feed, rule, and govern the whole church*, according as has been defined in the general councils, and as is contained in the sacred canons ‖." Doctor M. in p. 93 of the same work, asserts, on the authority of the councils of Florence and Trent, "that the Pope is head of the church, the doctor of all Christians, *the true vicar of Christ* §, *and the vicar of God Almighty upon earth* ¶." What blasphemy! Now, it is to be observed, that both the councils of Constance and Basil state, that the fourth Lateran is among those which all popes must swear *to maintain, defend, and inculcate to the least tittle*, even to the shedding of their blood **. This is a

* The Doctor speaks thus in a note on p. 66 of his Ecclesiastical Democracy. "I quoted the learned Dod to prove, that though the council of Trent was never *solemnly* received in England, which was evidently impracticable, it is believed no catholic will presume to reject it either as to doctrine or discipline." The council of Trent, as we shall prove, adopts and sanctions the fourth Lateran council, and those of Constance, Basil, and Florence, in the most unqualified manner; all which the Doctor quotes. The Doctor says of the council of Trent, in p. 66 of the same work, that the bishops "appeal to its authority, and are studious to regulate their conduct, in the discharge of their pastoral office, by its wise and holy canons of discipline."

† Can. 5.

‡ Second Council of Lyons, General Council of Trent, Council of Basil.

‖ In Decret. Union.

§ Concil Florent. in Decret. Un.

¶ Concil. Trident, sess. 6. cap. 1.

** Concil. Const. sess. 39. Basil, sess. 37.

complete refutation of what the Doctor said, that the third canon of the fourth Lateran council was a mere temporary regulation of discipline, and was essentially different from the first and second canons thereof; for the Doctor admits, that the pope swears to maintain it, even to *the least tittle, to the shedding of his blood. and the loss of his life.*

Dr. M. says, in p. 11 of the defence of his disciple Sir J. C. H., "The Antijacobin quotes the oath unfaithfully in the Latin, and still more unfaithfully translates it into English. Upon such grounds he accuses the popes of "preaching and enforcing infernal doctrines." But we ask the Doctor, whether he has not only preached, but enforced, such doctrines as were an unceasing source of discord and bloodshed in Europe for many centuries? We now give an extract from the oath, as presented to the public by the Doctor himself, in p. 10. After swearing to maintain the holy catholic faith, according to the first eight general councils, and also those of Nice, Lateran, Lyons, Constance, and Vienne, he says, "et illam fidem, usque *ad unum apicem*, immutilatam servare, et usque ad animam et sanguinem defensare et predicare *." The council of Trent † has not only decreed the fourth Lateran to be a general council, but that one of its definitions is, the voice of the whole church, and therefore these three general councils approve all that is cited from the fourth Lateran.

But in answer to the Doctor's assertion, that the third canon of the Lateran council was a matter of *mere temporary regulation*, we shall observe, that the decrees of many other general councils are as cruel and as sanguinary as the third canon of the fourth Lateran. The punishment, or the extirpation of heretics, is prescribed by the council of Constance, which sat about 200 years after that of the Lateran, sess. 45. tom. vii. p. 1121. apud Binium. Idem, sess. 45. tom. vii. p. 1125. By the general council of Sienna, confirmed by the bull of pope Martin V. *and approved of by the council of Constance*, Concil, tom. xii. p. 367: by the council of Bourges, *approved of by the general council of Basil*, Append. ad Concil. Basil, tom. viii. p. 200, apud Binium. Under what authority did so many popes issue damnatory bulls against sovereign princes, absolving their subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and ordering them to rise in arms against them? Doctor M. says, that the third canon of the fourth Lateran council, *was of no force in countries where it*

* Concil L'Abbé, tom. xii. p. 242, translation, "and to preserve, defend, and inculcate that faith to the least tittle, unmutilated, even to the shedding of my blood, and the loss of my life."

† Per Lateranse conciliam Ecclesia statuit, sess. 14. c. 5.

was not received. We shall again oppose the Doctor to himself.

In p. 97 of his Ecclesiastical Democracy, he says, "the pope has a right of addressing his *doctrinal instructions and ecclesiastical mandates* to every portion of the church, which mandates do not derive their authority from *the acceptance* of such portion of the church; and if they are not approved by the church at large, they are to be received as coming *from Christ himself**." If, then, the damnatory bulls and sanguinary mandates of the pope are infallible, and are to have universal force and operation in countries where they never *were received or acknowledged*, surely general councils must.

It is decreed by the council of Basil, "that a general council legitimately assembled cannot err; because, were this pernicious error allowed, the whole catholic faith may fall to the ground, and there would not be any certainty in the church: for should *an error in one* be admitted, the remainder of them may err." Tom. viii. p. 128, apud Binium. It is also determined, "that it would be *blasphemy* of any person to assert that the canons, sentences, and decrees of the general councils, were not dictated by the *Holy Ghost*." Ibid. p. 131 and 135.

We defy Dr. Milner to prove, that it was ever admitted in the Romish church, that one part of a council was to be received and the other rejected, or that the operation of all, or any part of it, in any country, depended on its reception; besides, the sanguinary canons of those councils which we have quoted, prescribing the nullity of oaths to heretics, and ordering their extermination, are addressed to *all emperors and kings, to all archbishops and bishops.*

The fourth Lateran council, after reciting many severe pains and penalties against believers, receivers, defenders, and favourers of heretics, such as excommunication, infamy, exclusion from public offices and councils, disability to make wills, to succeed to inheritances, to plead in the courts, to be allowed the sacrament, or christian burial, ends with the following clause†; "We therefore will and command, and by virtue of their obedience do enjoin the bishops expressly, that they be vigilant, diligently to execute these rules effectually, throughout their dioceses, as they wish to escape canonical punishments; for if any bishop be remiss or negligent in purging his diocese of heretical pravity, upon certain information thereof,

---

* The Doctor defends the infallibility of the pope in p. 97 and 98 of his Ecclesiastical Democracy.

† We gave the particulars of all this in p. 272 of our 28th volume.

he shall be deposed from his office, and another fit person appointed in his place, who shall be willing and able to destroy heretical pravity."

It is well known how faithfully the bishops in England discharged this pious duty, from the reign of Henry the Fourth, till that of Edward the Sixth, and afterwards in the reign of the bloody Queen Mary.

Doctor Milner knows that a popish priest is bound by his canonical oath to observe and enforce the general councils. This oath, when mentioned in the House of Commons by Dr. Duigenan, was very offensive *to the delicate ear* of Messrs. Barham and Smith. We give the following paragraphs of it, extracted from the Roman Pontifical.

" 5thly. The holy, catholic, apostolic, and Roman church, I acknowledge to be the mother and mistress of all churches; and to the Roman pontiff, successor of the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, vicar of Jesus Christ, I promise and swear true obedience."

" 6thly. All doctrines delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons, and by the general councils, and especially by the most holy council of Trent, without the smallest doubt, I receive and profess; and whatever is contrary thereto, and all heresies, condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church, I equally condemn, reject, and anathematize.

" 7thly. This true catholic faith, out of which there is no salvation, which at present I freely profess and sincerely hold, I do promise, vow, and swear, that I will most constantly retain and preserve inviolate, with God's help, unto the last breath of my life; and that as far as in me lieth, I will be careful that it be held by, taught, and preached to my parishioners, or those the care of whom shall belong to me in my function."

This oath is admirably calculated to attach the Romish priests to the holy see, and to bind them to make their congregations completely subservient to its ambitious designs; and accordingly we find that it has been productive of treasonable conspiracies, rebellions, and massacres, for some centuries, particularly in Ireland.

Those who peruse it attentively, cannot be surprised that Dr. Milner should denominate *saints and martyrs those holy men* who suffered for their endeavours to overturn the government of Queen Elizabeth, regarded as the bulwark of heresy; for they were acting agreeably to the decrees of many councils, but particularly the fourth Lateran *, whose canons they were ri-

* Dr. Jeremiah Taylor, the learned Bishop of Down, has truly said, that this council made transubstantiation a tenet of the Romish church, and at the same time treason the duty of subjects.

gidly bound by their oath to enforce. Doctor Milner, at a loss to refute our remarks on the pamphlet of his disciple, has recourse to the following pitiful expedient for that purpose. He says, in p. 8, that we quoted from canonists who never existed; and in a note "he professes to draw all his knowledge of the councils from a certain Bincus, "apud Bincum."—"This name occurs eleven times in the compass of a few pages." Dr. M. cannot but know that Binius, a canon of Cologne, published, in the seventeenth century, an edition of the general councils, which has been held in high estimation by the Romish divines; and that by an error of the press, the letter c was put instead of i. We also quoted the council of Alby, can. 19; but as the two words were joined together, he says, that "we refer to the council of Albycan," page 276; there never was such a council *.

Doctor Milner asserts, that "the third canon of the fourth council of Lateran was a mere temporary regulation of discipline, and the council speaks clearly of open warfare in that crusade, against the Albigenses, which soon after took place against *those rebels and murderers*, guilty not only of the most open violences and insurrections, but also of the secret infamies ascribed to them."

They could not be rebels against any person but their own sovereign, Raymond, Count of Thoulouse, and he approved of their conduct, and protected them as faithful and obedient subjects; and therefore he was excommunicated and deprived of his crown by Innocent III. "because he was a favourer of heretics," and his dominions were given by the pope to any person who would seize them †. In the year 1210, the citizens of Thoulouse, his subjects, were excommunicated by the council of Avignon ‡, because they refused to expel heretics. What right had the Pope to interfere with the subjects or the concerns of an independent prince? This council was not satisfied with claiming and exercising the power of deposing princes and exterminating heretics in *one instance*; they passed a decree confirming it in *all similar cases*, prescribing the mode in which it was to be carried into practice; and by the same decree, they sanctioned in all cases the power of absolving subjects from their oaths of allegiance. The decree is as follows.

---

* Doctor Milner, we suspect, will not be disposed to deny in secret, whatever his policy may lead him to deny in public, that we know as much of the councils and tenets of the church of Rome as himself, and that we appreciate their objects, nature, and tendency, much better.

† Concil. tom. xi. p. 35, apud Binium. ‡ Idem, 35.

"If the temporal lord being required and admonished by the church, shall neglect to purge his territories from heretical filth, he shall be excommunicated by the metropolitan and his suffragans; and if he neglect to give satisfaction within a year, this shall be signified to the pope, that he, from henceforth, may pronounce his subjects discharged from their allegiance, and expose his territories to be enjoyed by catholics, who, having exterminated the heretics, shall possess it without contradiction *."

"Secular powers, what offices soever they enjoy, shall be admonished, and if need be, compelled by ecclesiastical censures, that as they desire to be reputed Christians, so they will take an oath for the defence of the faith, that they will honestly endeavour to *exterminate heretics*, condemned by the church, out of their territories †." The general council of Constance requires "*all archbishops, bishops*, and others chosen for this work, to require and admonish kings, emperors, dukes, &c. to expel heretics from their territories, according to the 27th canon of the council of Lateran ‡. In addition to the decisions of many general councils, sanctioning and confirming the deposing and absolving powers, we have the bull of Gregory VII. against the Emperor Henry IV. whom he deposed. Philip I. of France was deposed by Urban II. in the council of Clermont; the Emperor Frederic II. by Innocent IV. in that of Lyons; and King John by Innocent III.

But it appears, from some of his former publications, that Dr. Milner himself has no great objection to the principle of exterminating heretics in the abstract, as will be evident from the following quotations. The author of the Pursuits of Literature observes, in a note on Milner, line 209, part iv. "But there is one pamphlet, not for any, even the least excellence in the composition, but for the virulence of its spirit, which I call into public notice, if the public will, or can feel on the subject. It is entitled, "A Reply to the Report made by the Cisalpine Club, on the Authenticity of the Protestation at the British Museum, &c. &c. by the Rev. John Milner, printed for Coghlan, Duke Street, Grosvenor Square, 1795." "It is written, as I am informed, by one John Milner, a provincial priest, resident (as I am informed) at Winchester, not an emigrant, nor in the King's House (while the priests lived there en masse), but the priest of a private chapel in that city. He seems by his writings,

* Concil. tom. vii. p. 148, 149.

† Concil. Lat. quartum, can. 8. apud Binium.

‡ Conc. Constant. sess. 45, tom. vii. p. 1121, apud Binium. Here the Lateran council is sanctioned by that of Constance.

(I know no more of him) to be of the most intolerant principles, and deliberate in the application of them. He exhibits, at once, the extremes of fierceness and impotence; but he represents a large portion of their body by whom he is accredited." "In another part of Mr. Milner's "Reply," his indignation rises against some expressions in the declaration of the catholics. We see the embers under which the fire is not extinguished. He is afraid that we, protestants, should think that the spirit of his church has suffered an abatement." "*Thus to my judgment*, (he cries out, p. 28,) *am I and the whole catholic body, without consenting to it, pledged in the face of the legislature to condemn the wars of Charlemagne and the crusades against the infamous Albigenses.*" "I hope we are all children of mercy, trained and educated in the benevolence and charity which Christ has taught and enforced; and if we have read the history of that murderous and infernal persecution of the devoted Albigenses (whose chief crime was their determined opposition and resistance to the papal tyranny), what opinion, or what comment, shall we form on this *merciless priest*, who, after the lapse of centuries, feels the same passion, and the same thirst of blood against those innocent victims of popish and arbitrary violence?—Crimine ab uno disce omnes."

"In a note, the author observes, "The Albigenses were a set of the Waldenses, who had their rise in the 12th century." "I know what the malice of their enemies has said against them. This is not a place to discuss history, but I refer the statesman to Thuanus, lib. 1 sec. 16. vol. i. p. 221. ed. Buckley. N. B. for their confession, which was presented to Francis I. by the Albigenses, I shall refer the theological and political reader to Sandius's Ecclesiastical History. It is an honour to their religion." The reader will find it in p. 442 of our 28th volume. Both Thuanus * and Mezeray † say, that they had the same principles as the French protestants. Doctor Allix proves this in his answer to Bossuet; and that they were free from the errors and corruptions of the church of Rome, even from the time of the apostles, appears in a work ‡ entitled, Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of the Albigenses, London, 1692, 4to ‖.

---

* Lib. 6. sec. 16.

† Mezeray says, Ils avoient à peu pres les memes opinions, que ceux, qu'on nomine aujourd'hui Calvinistes.

‡ A curious account of this work is to be seen in the Acta Eruditorum for June 1691.

‖ Mosheim says of them, "It is difficult to come to a fixed determination with respect to the character and doctrine of these people; for when we examine matters attentively, we shall find that even

In p. 7. Doctor Milner says, that in Kerry and Galway, where the catholics are most numerous, none of them were concerned in the rebellion. We appeal to the magistrates and respectable inhabitants of those counties, whether the mass of the catholics in them were not organized, and ready to rise; but they wanted leaders and arms, and were too far from the directory, which sat in Dublin, which was the center of motion. For the same reason the counties of Mayo and Sligo remained quiet during the first rebellion, and would have been reputed loyal; but after the grand rebellion was put down, one thousand French troops having landed at Killala in the former, many thousands of the popish multitude, headed by their priests from those and the adjacent counties, joined them; and a strong spirit of insurgency appeared in most parts of Connaught and Leinster.

About the same number of French troops landed during the last war at Fishguard in Pembrokeshire, and immediately all the people in the adjacent country rose in mass to oppose them. This marks strongly the great difference between the multitude in Great Britain and Ireland. In short, the former are instructed in all religious and moral duties, as prescribed by the holy scriptures: the latter imbibe the pestilent doctrines of the general councils from their spiritual guides, who are bound to infuse them into their flocks, by their canonical oath, of which we have given some paragraphs. The Doctor says, p 9, "He (the Antijacobin) conceals, that the very councils which he cites, confess that the church rejects all sanguinary punishments, and that if they proceeded to dispossess temporal lords of their lands, and the homage of their feudatory subjects, this was done by the authority of those emperors." This is an instance of jesuitical sophistry which frequently occurs in the controversial writings of Doctor Milner. Were all the emperors and sovereign princes, deprived by the Pope's bulls, privy and consenting to their own deposition? This is too absurd. In the same page he says, "Ecclesia non recipit sanguineas pœnas. iii. Lat. can. 27."

In p. 12, he says, "the known irregularity which catholic clergymen would incur by being concerned in any capital punishment whatever, as was decreed in the same fourth council of Lateran." This is a most extraordinary assertion from Dr. Milner, who quotes and defends the general councils in the

---

their enemies acknowledged the *sincerity of their piety*; but they were blackened by accusations, *which were evidently false*, and that the opinions for which they were punished differ widely from the Manichean system. Vol. ii. p. 581.

most unqualified manner, which have been a fruitful source of discord and bloodshed, and who still cherishes the sanguinary principle which produced the religious butcheries of the Albigenses and the Saxons. John Huss was burnt as a heretic at the instance of the council of Constance, consisting exclusively of ecclesiastics, in violation of the public faith given by the Emperor Sigismund. Jerome of Prague suffered the same punishment as a heretic, though protected by the public faith of the same council itself, by which perfidy was added to cruelty. The massacre of the Hugonots at Paris, on St. Bartholomew's day, and nearly at the same time all over France, under Charles IX. in which 40,000 persons * are supposed to have perished, was considered by pope Gregory XIII.† as an event of the most auspicious kind, celebrated it with public thanksgivings and rejoicings at Rome, and appointed a general jubilee for so signal an advantage obtained for the holy see‡. He sent a nuncio with the greatest solemnity to congratulate the king on the occasion, and struck a medal himself, on the reverse of which was an angel slaughtering the Hugonots, with this inscription, Hugonotorum strages 1572§. Sextus V. excommunicated Henry III. of France, because he spared the blood of his protestant subjects; and he granted nine years indulgence to such of his people as should rise in arms against him. In consequence of this, he was murdered by Jaques Clement, a friar. In a public consistory at Rome, the pope applauded the virtue and firmness of the assassin, in a long premeditated speech, declared that his fervent zeal towards God surpassed that of Judith and Eleazer, and that this assassination was effected by the ordinance of divine providence ‖.

On the death of Henry III. the Parisians consulted the doctors of the Sorbonne, to know whether they should submit to Henry IV. to whom the crown belonged by hereditary right; and they declared, that it was forbidden by *the divine law*, to admit a sectary, or a favourer of a sectary to the kingdom, and that he, as such, having *been excluded by the holy see*, those who assisted him *would be damned*. They also promised eternal happiness, and a crown of martyrdom, to those who should oppose him and his abettors, *even to the shedding of blood*,

---

* Davila, lib. v p. 320. ed. Lond.

† We before stated, that Doctor Milner and his disciple praised this pope for having declared that the bull of Pius V. was not binding on the English catholics.

‡ Thuanus, lib. 63, sec. 4.

§ Idem, lib. 53, cap. 4.

‖ Idem, lib. 96, sec 40.

"usque ad effusionem sanguinis *." When William Parry, a Roman catholic gentleman, undertook to murder Queen Elizabeth, he hesitated to do so, till he had previously obtained the Pope's † absolution, which Cardinal Como procured for him; and when arrested, the cardinal's letter was found on his person, in which he was promised *plenary indulgence, and a full remission of his sins* ‡.

But the inquisition comprised in itself all the horrors of religious persecution, under the most dreadful and inhuman form, in which *ecclesiastics presided*. The popes applauded it, and sanctioned it by their authority; gave it system and form, and would have established it throughout Europe, but that several catholic countries dreading the miseries which it would have produced, opposed its introduction.

The execution of the sentence of the inquisition on a heretic, is attended with the most diabolical hypocrisy. When they deliver the condemned person to the civil magistrate, they implore mercy for him, and request that he may be free "*from all danger of death, or mutilation of member* ‖;" but notwithstanding all this seeming piety and tenderness, when they have sentenced a heretic to death, they require the "magistrate to execute the sentence within six days, upon pain of excommunication, deprivation, and loss of authority and offices," according to the constitution of Innocent VIII. "Within five days," by the constitution of Innocent IV. The Popes have uniformly approved and confirmed the decrees of emperors, kings, &c. which command heretics to be put to death. Such is the Jesuitical sophism of Romish divines, when they assert that "the church rejects all sanguinary punishments."

In our strictures on Sir J. C. H.'s pamphlet, p. 29. of our 29th volume, we quoted a passage from the Hibernia Dominicana of the Rev. Doctor Thomas Burke, titular bishop of Ossory, to prove respectively the number of protestants and papists in Ireland. Now we beseech the reader to observe the consistency of Doctor Milner on this point. In his Tour through Ireland, he speaks thus of him, "the Right Reverend Thomas Burke, bishop of Ossory, *a learned and celebrated historian* of the order of St. Dominick;" but because his enu-

---

* Thuanus, sec. 19.

† According to Doctor Milner, he is *the head of the church, the doctor of all Christians, the true Vicar of Christ, and the Vicar of God upon earth.*

‡ Speed, 873.

‖ Pontif. Rom. Romæ. 1611. p. 456. Sir John C. H. says, concurring with his preceptor, that persecution is not a principle of the Romish church.

meration of the people of Ireland overturns the hypothesis of Sir J. C. H., he, in p. 19, in the defence of his disciple, published *long after his Tour*, does not blush to call the very same prelate, *the uninformed Thomas Burke*. How vain is any attempt to contend in argument with this Proteus:

"Ille suæ contra non immemor artis,
Omnia transformat sic in miracula rerum."

Doctor Milner accuses us of using severe and ungentlemanly language; he calls us calumniators, and says, that we merit rather the appellation of Jacobin than Antijacobin reviewers. In p. 13, of the Defence, he says, "What pains do these men take, not to induce us to be loyal, trust-worthy, and charitable, but to force us, as far as in them lies, to be rebellious, perfidious, and sanguinary!"

Such remarks come very improperly from the Doctor, whose writings are well known to be virulently abusive and inflammatory, The Christian Philosopher, written by him in the year 1806*, and addressed to the Hibernian Society in London, is peculiarly calculated to irritate his fellow votaries against the government; for he explicitly tells them, that, "With them (protestants) extirpation is their favourite object; to extirpate either papists or popery is their favourite study, and the ultimate end of their most laboured plans †;" yet he admits that "the countenance of government brought to them a great accession of strength." After accusing Mr. Pitt's government of great tyranny and cruelty towards the Irish catholics, he says, "But all things here below must have an end. Mr. Pitt ‡ closed his earthly career; and a persecuting administration was succeeded by one of a different cast."

The Doctor has made his History of Winchester the vehicle of an apology for popery, and a satire on the reformation, especially the established church; for, on all occasions, he studiously introduces, defends, and praises, the establishments, the doctrines, the ceremonies, and politics of the former; and he sedulously abuses, vilifies, and misrepresents the principles of protestantism, and all the great men who distinguished themselves in its favour, from its origin to the present time.

The account of his tour through Ireland in 1807, and which

---

* This was printed by Hugh Fitzpatrick, printer and bookseller to the Royal College of Maynooth, who would not dare to publish a single page, without the approbation of the heads of that seminary.

† The penal laws were repealed, and the funds for the endowment of Maynooth College, were granted by the protestant parliament of Ireland.

‡ It is well known what sacrifices Mr. Pitt made for the Irish papists.

was published in 1808, is one of the most virulent libels that ever was written, with impunity, against the government and the established religion of a civilized state, by one of its own subjects. He has made it the vehicle of controversy; for there is scarcely a tenet of popery that he has not brought forward, maintained, and defended, in it; and it has a strong tendency to inflame the popish multitude against the government; although Messrs. Grattan and Sheridan, the unqualified advocates of the catholics, have said, not many months since, that there is a strong French party organized in Ireland. The moderate and rational catholics of Ireland condemn his conduct at present as much as the English did in 1791; and the former deprecate a repetition of his mission to Ireland, conscious that he has already most materially injured their cause by his turbulence and intemperate zeal.

It is astonishing that any person who possesses the feelings and the principles, or has any pretensions to the character, of a gentleman, could use such gross scurrility and bitter invective, as he has in his Tour, against different persons, but particularly against Lord Redesdale and Doctor Duigenan, two members of the legislature. Can there be a stronger proof of the mildness of that government, which Dr. M. reviles and accuses of severity and tyranny, than that the author or printer of this atrocious libel has not been prosecuted?

Doctor M. says, in p. 21, "I disdain to notice the assertion, that the mass of Irish papists paid no regard to an oath of allegiance in the rebellion in 1798." We appeal to the magistrates and the loyal subjects of Ireland for the truth of this assertion; and it is most certain, that for this reason, the numerous corps of yeomen in the counties of Wexford and Wicklow will not admit a papist amongst them*. In this the papists have acted agreeably to the tenets of their religion.

It is decreed by the third council of Lateran, "that the subjects of heretical princes are declared to be released from all duties of fealty, homage, and obedience." A decretal of Gregory XI. A.D. 1179, is couched in the following words: "Those who are bound by any compact, however strongly confirmed, to persons manifestly fallen into heresy, shall know that they are absolved from the duty of fidelity, homage, and obedience." Doctor M. maintains and defends the papal in-

* As Earl Fitzwilliam is a vehement encomiast of the zealous loyalty of the Irish catholics, we recommend to him to appeal to Captain Wainwright, a respectable gentleman, who is his agent in the county of Wicklow, and who commands a numerous corps of yeomen there, for the truth of what we assert.

fallibility in the most unqualified manner in p. 97 and 98 of his Ecclesiastical Democracy, which we have already proved.

To palliate the dreadful Irish rebellion of 1641, which we described in p. 432 of our 18th volume, in page 236 of our 24th, and the leading features of which we gave in p. 130 of our 29th volume, Dr. M. says, in p. 46, "In answer to the reviewer's misrepresented and inflamed account of the Irish catholics during the grand rebellion, I shall only satisfy myself with saying, that when the English and Scotch nations were up in arms for the destruction of the king and constitution, and *particularly for destroying root and branch, men, women, and children, of the said catholics*, as Charles I. confesses was the case, they would have been wanting to the first law of nature, if they had not stood upon their defence." Here the Doctor has been guilty of a gross anachronism, founded in a most obvious perversion of historic truth, and of a most flagitious libel on the people of Great Britain, in accusing them of a deliberate and malicious design of massacring a great portion of their fellow subjects. The Irish rebellion broke out suddenly and unexpectedly on the 23d of October, 1641, at which time the differences between Charles I. and his parliament had not an alarming aspect; and it is most probable that they never would have been carried to any serious length, had not that unfortunate monarch adopted the rash and ill-advised measure, of attempting to seize five members of the House of Commons, which did not take place till the 5th of January, 1642; and there was not a sword drawn in England till the 23d of October, 1642, a year after the explosion of the horrid Irish rebellion. The principal nobility and gentry of England and Scotland, headed the court and country parties, into which they were unfortunately divided; and the leaders of each felt the purest motives, though they were impelled by intemperate zeal, and were actuated by the mistaken notion, that they were fighting in defence of the constitution*, for which they armed, (long after the Irish rebellion had broken out,) "*and not for the destruction of the constitution, and particularly for destroying root and branch, men, women, and children, of the catholics.*" That great statesman and patriot Lord Clarendon, who was an eye-witness of these melancholy events,

* The boundaries of the constitution were not accurately known at that time, nor were they well ascertained, till afterwards, by the petition and the Bill of Rights. One party, in defence of the king, might, had they succeeded, have extended the royal prerogative too far; the other were guided by a set of knaves and hypocrites, who formed a republic on the ruins of the constitution.

observes, in the third book of his History, "It will not be impertinent or unnatural to this present discourse, to set down in this place, the present temper and disposition of both houses of parliament, that it may be the less wondered at, that *so prodigious an alteration should be made in so short a time*, and the crown fallen so low, that it could neither support itself and its own majesty, nor those who would appear faithful to it. Of the House of Peers, the great contrivers and designers were, first, the Earl of Bedford, a wise man, and of too great and plentiful a fortune, to wish a subversion of the government; and it quickly appeared, that he only intended to make himself and his friends great at court."

"In the House of Commons were many persons of wisdom and gravity, who, being possessed of great and plentiful fortunes, though they were not devoted enough to the court, had all imaginable duty to the king, and affection to the government, established by law and ancient custom; and without doubt the major part of that body consisted of men, who had no mind to break the peace of the kingdom, or to make any considerable alteration in the government of church or state." Such are the men whom Doctor Milner charges with a deliberate design of massacring all the Irish papists!

The Irish rebellion had been planned and organized long before it broke out. Even Mac Mahon, the titular bishop of Raphoe, acknowledged before some members of the privy council, that he and others had been employed so early as the year 1634, to solicit aid from the pope, the kings of France and Spain, to promote that rebellion; and it appears by Lord M'Guire's confession, that application had been made for assistance so early as the year 1628, to Cardinal Richelieu, for the purpose of forwarding that design. Hugh Oge M'Mahon, a rebel leader, who was arrested in Dublin on the night of the 23d of October, in which the insurrection there was to have taken place, confessed, *that all the lords and gentlemen in the kingdom that were papists, were engaged in the plot*, that on that very day all the forts and strong places in Ireland would be taken, that Lord M'Guire, and several other Irish gentlemen, were come up to Dublin to seize the castle, and that they were to be joined by twenty persons from each county. His evidence was confirmed by that of Owen O'Connolly, who declared, that M'Mahon had owned to him, that the Irish had prepared men in all parts of the kingdom, to destroy all the English that night. Lord M'Guire acknowledged in his confession, that he knew of the plot so early as the month of January, 1640, and that application had been made to foreign princes for assistance towards engaging the nation in a war.

Hugh O'Reilly, of the county of Down, Edmund O'Junnagh, of the county of Antrim, Maurice M'Credon, of the county of Tyrone, and James Hallahan, of the county of Armagh, all papists, declared upon oath, that the priests, jesuits, and friars of England, Ireland, Spain, and other foreign countries, had been the projectors and contrivers of that rebellion, and that they had been six years in making preparations for it. All these depositions are to be found in Temple, Borlase, Nelson, and Warner, of which the originals are in the library of Trinity College, Dublin.

The confederate catholics assembled at Kilkenny, consisting of the nobility, gentry, and bishops of their order, assumed the forms, and usurped all the powers and functions of the legislative and executive departments of the state, having a speaker or prolocutor, with a great seal, to authenticate all their acts of sovereignty, and their credentials, in all their negotiations with foreign princes, to whom they sent, and from whom they received ambassadors. They levied money, raised a large body of forces, of which they appointed Viscount Gormanstown commander in chief, with four provincial generals under him. They carried on a most destructive war for many years, in the course of which they offered Ireland to the pope, the kings of France and Spain; and they finally invested the Duke of Lorraine with it, sooner than submit to their liege sovereign. When all their efforts to expel the Marquis of Ormond, the king's viceroy, by arms, proved unsuccessful, they accomplished it by ordering their bishops to issue an excommunication against any persons who should in any manner abet or assist him; which they did on the 12th of August, 1650, at Jamestown. During this dreadful war, the flame of rebellion was fanned by a number of missionaries from Rome, particularly by Rinuceini, the pope's nuncio, an intemperate fanatic, who, with the ecclesiastical congregation, issued, "a decree of excommunication against such persons as should adhere to the late peace (made in 1646) and bear arms for *the heretics of Ireland, and do aid and assist them.*" Though the old Irish papists, and the English * of the pale, had been ever hostile to each other, they united in this war against the king's government.

Lord Orrery observes on this, "the union of the old Irish papists and the English, which the Pope himself could not effect, the dethroning his Majesty has accomplished. They who could never concur in any thing else, agree in this, and

* That is, of English blood, but born in Ireland.

it is the very bond of their iniquity. I will say no more on this subject, but that Herod and Pilate could be friends when it was to crucify Christ *."

In the year 1646, they concluded a peace with the Marquis of Ormond, which, by a proclamation, they ordered all persons to obey and submit to, and yet they treacherously attacked him soon after, when, on the faith of that peace, he was leaving Dublin; and they bound one of their generals, Preston, by an oath, "to exercise all acts of hostility against the Marquis of Ormond and his party, and to help, advise with council, and assist in that service, the lieutenant general of Ulster, employed in the same expedition."

After all this, Doctor Milner boasts of the loyalty of the Irish catholics, and pretends that Swift speaks thus of them in the 8th volume of his works, p. 52, Dublin edition. "They never attempted to fight against, to imprison, to betray, to sell, to bring to trial, or to murder their king. They lost their estates in the great rebellion, *for fighting in defence of their king*, whilst the schismatics, who cut off the father's head, and forced the son to fly for his life, obtained grants of their estates. Thus they gained by their rebellion, what the catholics lost by their *loyalty* †." There is no such passage to be found in Swift, and even if he had made such assertions, they are obviously unfounded‡.

After the restoration, the leaders in that dreadful rebellion had the hardened audacity to approach the throne, to implore the royal favour and protection, in consideration of their loyalty, and a restoration of their estates, of which they said that they had been deprived, for their firm attachment to his father; but the king, justly incensed at their effrontery and dissimulation, declared, "he was infinitely satisfied that the Irish (papists) deserved their sufferings, and he sharply reproved the deputies for daring to appear before him with so much guilt

---

* Answer to Peter Walsh's letter.

† They presented two addresses to the Rump Parliament, (that cut off the King's head) in 1652, in which they expressed *their constant good affection to it*, and that *they put their consciences, lives, and fortunes, as in a sanctuary, under it.*

‡ Dr. M. says, in p. 227 of his Ecclesiastical Democracy, "The same disinterested principle of loyalty, which made the great body of the catholics spend their blood and treasure in defence of their sovereign (Charles I.) kept them steady in the same cause, in spite of redoubled cruelties and confiscations, during the remainder of the life of this ill-fated prince, and during the unsuccessful struggle and exile of his son and successor.

upon them, and forbad them for ever his presence and court*." Our readers will find the whole of this minutely described in p. 427 of our 18th volume.

Doctor Milner, in p. 44, and his disciple, in p. 122, of his intended speech, boast of the opinions of foreign universities, obtained in the year 1788, that the claim of the Pope to temporal honour, his power to absolve from oaths taken to an heretical government, and the extirpation of heretics, were not tenets of the Romish church. We proved the contrary in p. 225 of our 29th volume, and we hope, that we have done so in a satisfactory manner in these strictures. The English government must therefore have been grossly imposed upon in giving any credit to their opinions.

As Sir John C. Hippisley is in the habit of receiving prelections on the christian doctrine, from his pious preceptor, Doctor M., we would recommend to his perusal, for the sake of edification, the relation of a miracle recorded by him, in a pamphlet published in 1806, by Keating, Browne, and Co. London.

It is briefly this: a woman of the name of Winifred White, of Wolverhampton, was reduced to such a degree of debility, by a complication of disorders, that, unable to move herself, *she was carried to and from bed like a new-born infant.* As her malady had baffled the powers of medicine, administered by the advice of very able physicians, she was recommended by two popish priests, her spiritual guides, to repair to the holy well of her namesake St. Winifred, at Holywell, in Flintshire, with an assurance that she would be restored to perfect health, by bathing in it, provided she had faith in her saintship. She accordingly complied, and *on her first bathing, all her pains and maladies quite left her; and she was in every respect so well, as to be enabled to walk, run, or work, as well as ever.* The Doctor has certified this to be a true miracle, with his signature and the sign of the cross annexed; and he therein states other miracles wrought by the same means, by which some converts were made to popery. He tells us also, that in authenticating this miracle, he has acted according to the council of Trent, which directs, that "no new miracles are to be allowed, unless with the approbation of the bishop, who, as soon as he has made any discovery thereof, is to confer thereon with some theologians and other pious men, and that he is to do what is consonant *to truth*, and the faith concerning the same." The learned Doctor makes the following observations on these prodigies. "I maintain that on all such occasions the cures have been sought for and obtained, as on

* Harris's Fiction Unmasked, and Life of Lord Orrery, prefixed to his State Letters.

the present occasion, by supernatural means, namely, by prayer, and a strong faith in the omnipotence of God, with hope in the prayers offered up to God by the blessed Virgin and St. Winifred." "We assert, that God is pleased from time to time to manifest supernatural effects in our communion, *and that exclusively in our communion*;" and that miracles "clearly point out that body of Christians amongst the rival communions, *which the divine Founder of christianity sanctions.*"

The Doctor then proceeds to assure us, that on the canonization of saints, the most severe and jealous scrutiny is made, as to the proofs of their sanctity.

We shall conclude with wishing, that the pious Doctor may procure that honour for his friend and disciple, Sir John C. H. as a reward for the zeal which he has manifested in the service of *the Doctor of all Christians, the true Vicar of Christ, and the Vicar of God upon earth.*

An Introduction to Physiological and Systematical Botany. By James Edward Smith, M. D. F. R. S. &c. President of the Linnæan Society. pp. 556. 8vo. 15 plates. 14s. Longman and Co. and White.

THE well known talents and professional experience of Dr. Smith, naturally excite attention to any work bearing his name. In many of the votaries to botany, also, particularly of national botany, this emotion will necessarily be accompanied with that of gratitude to a man whose uniform and unceasing labours have all tended to make known the vegetable beauties and riches of his native country and her colonies. The present work, therefore, must be considered as another and not unsuccessful effort of our author to disseminate a knowledge of his favourite science, and to render it not merely more familiar, but more useful to the generality of readers. Vegetable physiology, indeed, although Dr. S. will not allow it to include the whole of what can properly be called the science of botany, must nevertheless be considered as embracing the most scientific part of it, as nomenclature and classification may be referred to language and mechanical order. In justice, however, to this pleasing study, which certainly teaches its professors to "look through nature up to Nature's God," we must notice some of the author's prefatory recommendations. After observing very justly, that there is really no one work in the English language, which is adapted to the use of tyros "in that very pleasing and instructive part of botany, the anatomy and physiology of plants," Rose's *Elements*, and Darwin's *Phytalogia*, being confined to that of

adepts, Dr. S. states his opinion of the necessity and use of an introductory publication which "might be capable of leading into the depths of botanical philosophy, whether physiological, systematical, or critical, any student who should be desirous of proceeding so far." We perfectly concur with him, that there is more vanity than science displayed by these botanists who have been most forward in proposing alterations in the Linnæan arrangements. "Speculative alterations in an artificial system are endless, and scarcely answer any more useful purpose than changing the order of letters in an alphabet."

"The illustration of the Linnæan system of classification, (continues Dr. S.) is, however, but a small part of my aim. To explain and to apply to practice those beautiful principles of method, arrangement, and discrimination, which render botany not merely an amusement, a motive for taking air and exercise, or an assistance to many other arts and sciences, but a school for the mental powers, an alluring incitement for the young mind to try its growing strength, and a confirmation of the most enlightened understanding in some of its sublimest, most important truths. That every path tending to ends so desirable may be accessible, I have not confined myself to systematical subjects, wide and various as they are, but I have introduced the anatomy and physiology of plants to the botanical student, wishing to combine all these several objects; so far, at least, that those who do not cultivate them all, may be sensible of the value of each in itself. I have treated of physiological and anatomical subjects in the first place, because a true knowledge of the structure and parts of plants seems necessary to the right understanding of botanical arrangement; and I trust the most superficial reader will here find enough for that purpose, even though he should not be led to pursue these subjects further by himself. I have every where aimed at familiar illustrations and examples, referring, as much as possible, to plants of easy acquisition.

"Of the benefits of natural science in the improvement of many arts, no one doubts. Our food, our physic, our luxuries, are improved by it. By the inquiries of the curious, new acquisitions are made in remote countries, and our resources of various kinds are augmented. The skill of Linnæus by the most simple observation, founded, however, on scientific principles, taught his countrymen to destroy an insect, the *cantharis navalis*, which had cost the Swedish government many thousand pounds a year, by its ravages on the timber of one dock-yard only. After its metamorphoses, and the season when the fly laid its eggs, were known, all its ravages were stopped by immersing the timber in water during that period. One man, in our days, by his scientific skill alone, has given the bread-fruit to the West Indies, and his country justly honours his character and pursuits. All this is acknowledged; we are no longer in the infancy of science, in which its utility, not having been proved, might be doubted, nor is it for this that I contend. I would recommend botany for its own sake. I have often alluded to its benefits as a mental exercise, nor can any study exceed it in raising curiosity, gratifying a taste for beauty and

ingenuity of contrivance, or sharpening the powers of discrimination. What, then, can be better adapted to young persons? The chief use of a great part of our education is no other than what I have just mentioned. The languages and the mathematics, however valuable in themselves, when acquired, are even more so, as they train the youthful mind to thought and observation. In Sweden, natural history is the study of the schools, by which men rise to preferment; and there are no people with more acute and better-regulated minds than the Swedes. Another idea is indeed worthy to mix in the pure contemplation of nature, the anticipation of the pleasure we may have to bestow on kindred minds with our own, in sharing with them our discoveries and our acquisitions. This is truly an object worthy of a good man, the pleasure of communicating virtuous, disinterested pleasure to those who have the same tastes with ourselves; or of guiding young ingenuous minds to worthy pursuits; and facilitating their acquisition of what we have already obtained. The natural history of animals, in many respects even more interesting than botany to man, as an animated being, and more striking in some of the phenomena which it displays, is in other points less pleasing to a tender and delicate mind. In botany all is elegance and delight; no painful, disgusting, unhealthy experiments, or inquiries, are to be made. Its pleasures spring up under our feet, and as we pursue them, reward us with health and serene satisfaction. None but the most foolish and depraved could derive any thing from it but what is beautiful, or pollute its lovely scenery with unamiable or unhallowed images. Those who do so, either from corrupt taste or malicious design, can be compared only to the fiend entering into the garden of Eden."

The contents of the chapters in this volume, which by some strange omission are not inserted, will convey to the reader a tolerably accurate idea of the various and interesting subjects discussed. These are "Distinctions between animals, vegetables, and fossils; on the vital principle essential to the two former; definition of natural history, particularly botany; of the general texture of plants; of the cuticle or epidermis, cellular integument, bark, wood, medula or pith, sap-vessels and course of the sap, with Mr. Knight's theory of vegetation; sap and insensible perspiration; secreted fluids of plants; grafting; heat of the vegetable body; process of vegetation; cotyledons; root, and its different kinds; stems and stalks of plants; buds; leaves, their situation, figure, &c.; functions of leaves; fulcra, or appendages to a plant; efflorescence, or mode of flowering, and its various forms; flower and fruit; fructification, nectarium, corolla, seeds, &c. peculiar functions of the stamens and pistils, with the experiments and observations of Linnæus and others; diseases of plants, particularly as illustrative of their vital principle; systematical arrangement of plants; natural and artificial methods; genera, species, varieties, and nomenclature; Linnæan artificial system, classes, and orders; palmæ, and preparation of an herbarium."

These subjects evidently embrace the whole of the vegetable kingdom, beginning very properly with definitions of the elementary principles. Dr. Smith adopts the distinction or definition of Mirbel on Vegetables. "That plants alone have a power of deriving nourishment, though not indeed exclusively, from inorganic matter, mere earths, salts, or airs, substances certainly incapable of serving as food for animals, the latter only feeding on what is or has been organized matter, either of a vegetable or animal nature; so that it should seem to be the office of vegetable life alone to transform dead matter into organized and living bodies." Burning is recommended as the test for discriminating between vegetables and corals or corallines, the smell of the latter discovering their animal affinity.

Dr. Smith divides that part of natural history called botany into three branches; "1st, The physiology of plants, or a knowledge of the structure and functions of their different parts; 2dly, the systematical arrangement and denomination of their several kinds; and 3dly, their economical or radical properties. All these objects should be kept in view by an intelligent botanist. The two first are of essential service to each other, and the last is only to be pursued, with any certainty, by such as are versed in the other two. The present publication is intended to explain the fundamental principles of them all, with as much practical illustration as may be necessary for those who wish to become well acquainted with this delightful science." The analogies between the animal and vegetable cuticle or epidermis are examined, and that of the aloes plant, which will lie for many weeks in the sun without drying, and yet when partly dry, will become plump again in a few hours if plunged into water, is considered as peculiarly adapted for sandy dry soils and ditches in tropical regions. In the cuticle of many plants silex has been found, and Mr. Davy has found it in some English grasses. The cuticle of the common nettle is extended into rigid hairs or bristles, which are perforated and contain a venomous fluid. The cork-tree, common maple, and Dutch elm, are covered with a spongy substance, familiar as cork. Under the cellular integument exists the bark, in which the peculiar virtues or qualities of particular plants chiefly reside; as the resin of the fir and juniper, the astringent or tanning principle of the oak and willow. In treating of the bark from actual observation, the author bears a voluntary testimony to the advantages derived from the late Mr. Forsythe's method of plastering any wounds or defects in trees. We notice this more particularly, that many invidious half-informed persons have lately attempted to cast a ridicule on the process. Subsequent

experiments, indeed, have tended to confirm the utility of the simple means used by Forsythe for recovering the wounded bark of trees. The idea suggested by Darwin in his *Phytologia*, that what have been taken for air-vessels are really absorbents, and destined to nourish the plant, is perfectly reconcileable with the same facts. Mr. Knight, in our author's estimation, has improved on this doctrine, so as to "establish no less than an entirely new theory of vegetation, by which the real use and functions of the principal organs of plants are now for the first time satisfactorily explained." Dr. Smith, however, will be somewhat disappointed to find Mr. Knight himself, in the Philosophical Transactions of the present year, raising some doubts respecting the accuracy of this theory, especially in what relates to the functions of the alburnum. There is yet ample field for investigation in this subject, which has been so ably and so successfully pursued by this great vegetable physiologist. Dr. Smith calls sap-vessels, those comprehending the common tubes of the alburnum, and the central vessels of Knight, which are analogous to the arteries of animals; or rather, they are the stomach, lacteals, and arteries all in one; for he conceives it to be an error in Darwin, "to call by this name the vessels which contain the peculiar secretions of the plant. These sap-vessels, no doubt, absorb the nutritious fluids afforded by the soil, in which, possibly, as they pass through the root, some change analogous to digestion may take place." This conclusion, however, is rather analogous and conjectural, than founded on experiment; for it presumes, that all the nourishment of plants is received by the roots, although it is well known that the leaves have some concern in this important office. Experiments are yet wanted to establish these facts, or rather opinions, on an indisputable basis.

In treating of the insensible perspiration and irritability (or, as he now calls it, *excitability*) of plants, the discovery of which first made him known to the philosophical world, Dr. Smith very prettily accounts for the greater vivacity, if we may so term it, of plants in spring than in autumn, by alleging, that their excitability has accumulated during the supension of vegetation in winter. This he applies to explain why plants bud in spring, when the temperature is lower than in autumn, when they generally decline or become torpid. The same "principle accounts for the occasional flowing of the sap in autumn, after a slight frost. Such a premature cold increases the sensibility of the plant to any warmth that may follow, and produces, in a degree, the same state of its constitution as exists after the longer and severer cold of winter." The Doctor adds another illustration from the animal kingdom. "Every one

conversant with labouring cattle, must have observed," says he, "how much sooner they are exhausted by the warm days of autumn, when the nights are cold, than in much hotter weather in summer; and this is surely from the same cause as the autumnal flowing of the vegetable sap." This explanation is at least ingenious and plausible. We were surprized to see the author gravely stating that "the sap or lymph of most plants in the spring soon undergoes *fermentation* and *putrefaction*," terms which certainly convey erroneous ideas of the fact; and however the former may be tolerable, the latter is surely altogether inadmissible. We must also be pardoned for our skepticism, on the reported estimate of the evaporation of the cornelian cherry-tree (*Cornus Mascula*). "The quantity of fluid (we are told by Duhamel) which evaporates from it in the course of twenty-four hours, is nearly equal to twice the weight of the whole shrub!" The various secretions of plants, such as gums, resins, mucilage, sugar, &c. has furnished the author with curious and interesting observations for a very amusing chapter.

"It is curious to observe," he remarks, "not only the various secretions of different plants, or families of plants, by which they differ from each other in taste, smell, qualities, and medical virtues, but also their great number and striking difference, frequently in the same plant. Of this the peach-tree offers a familiar example. The gum of this tree is mild and mucilaginous. The bark, leaves, and flowers, abound with a bitter secretion of a purgative and rather dangerous quality, than which nothing can be more distinct from the gum. The fruit is replete, not only with acid, mucilage, and sugar, but with its own peculiar aromatic and highly volatile secretion, elaborated within itself, on which its fine flavour depends. How far are we still from understanding the whole anatomy of the vegetable body, which can create and keep separate such distinct and discordant substances! Nothing is more astonishing than the secretion of flinty earth by plants, which, though never suspected till within a few years, appears to me well ascertained. A substance is found in the hollow stem of the bamboo (*Arundo bambos, L.* the *Nastos* of Theophrastus) called Tabaxir or Tabasheer, which is supposed in the East Indies (probably because it is rare and difficult of acquisition, like the imaginary stone in the head of a toad,) to be endowed with extraordinary virtues. Some of it brought to England, underwent a chemical examination, and proved, as nearly as possible, pure flint. Common wheat straw, when burnt, is found to contain a portion of flinty earth, in the form of a most exquisite powder, and this accounts for the utility of burnt straw in giving the last polish to marble. How great is the contrast between this production, if it be a secretion, of the tender vegetable frame, and those exhalations which constitute the perfume of flowers! One is among the most permanent substances in nature, an ingredient in the primæval mountains of the globe, the other the invisible, untangible breath of a moment! The odour of plants is unquestionably of a resinous nature, a volatile essential oil,

and several phenomena attending it well deserve attention and consideration."

Of the colouring matter of fruits, we know as little as we do of their secretions; it is doubtless owing to modifications of oxygen and carbon, but in what proportion has hitherto baffled conjecture. The juices of some fungi, as *boletus bovinus* and *agaricus deliciosus*, change immediately on exposure to the air, from yellow to dark blue or green; the juice of the indigo plant is known to owe its deep blue entirely to the absorption of oxygen; and the colouring matter of raspberries is blue turned red by the acid of the fruit. The oxalic and acetous acids only are the products of plants. In treating of the heat of vegetables, and particularly of the effects of temperature on buds, Dr. S. appears to be rather too philosophical in his explanations. "When buds," he says, "begin to expand, they become vastly more sensible:" Very true; not so what follows. "Nor is this owing, as *vulgarly* supposed, merely to the greater power of the cold to penetrate through their opening buds. It must penetrate equally through them in the course of long and severe winter frosts, which are never known to injure them. The extremely pernicious effects, therefore, of cold on opening buds, can only be attributed to the increased susceptibility of the vital principle, after it has been revived by the warmth of spring." Now we would ask the learned Doctor, if he does not think that cold, which is demonstrated to be as reflexible as heat, may act mechanically upon the expanded bud, and retard or obstruct the circulation of its fluids? The preceding remark of their bearing uninjured the severe winter frosts, is evidently an oversight, as they exist during that period only in embryo, and of course are shielded from the external cold. In a subsequent page, the author remarks, that "buds resist cold only till they begin to grow," that is, till they expand a surface on which the atmospheric cold can impinge, and thereby obstruct their circulation. Without, therefore, having recourse to any refined speculations on increased susceptibility, or mysterious action of the vital principle, the vulgar opinion in this case is the more simple, and also the more philosophical, though not quite correct, as the cold does not acquire "greater power" but only a greater field of action. Dr. S. is much more correct in his illustration of the nature and exertions of the roots of trees.

"When a tree happens to grow from seed on a wall, it has been observed, on arriving at a certain size, to stop for a while, and send down a root to the ground. As soon as this root was established in the soil, the tree continued increasing to a large magnitude. Here the vital powers of the tree not being adequate, from scanty nourishment, to the usual annual degree of increase in the branches, were

accumulated in the root, which therefore was excited to an extraordinary exertion, in its own natural direction, downward. There is no occasion then to suppose, as some have done, that the tree had any information of the store of food at the foundation of the wall, and voluntarily sent down its root to obtain it; nor is it wonderful that the Author of life should provide for it as effectually as it could for itself, had it really been a reflecting being. So in the case with grasses, when the *phleum pratense* (or *p. nodosum*) is situated in a fluctuating soil, it loses its fibrous roots and acquires a bulbous one; but on being removed to an entirely wet soil it again resumes its fibrous roots. I have also found the *Alopecurus geniculatus*, (an aquatic plant, whose root is naturally fibrous and creeping) growing with an ovate, juicy bulb on the top of a dry wall. Here I presume the herb, being in the first instance starved, by a failure of the nutrimental fluids hitherto conveyed by the water of the soil, its growth would be checked, and when checked, the same growth could not, as we know by observation on vegetation in general, be instantaneously renewed. A sudden fresh supply of food would therefore cause an accumulation of vital energy in the root, which would consequently resume a degree of vigour and a luxuriant mode of growth not natural to it, and become bulbous. Thus it requires a resource against such checks in future, and the herb is preserved alive, though in a very far less luxuriant state than when regularly and uniformly supplied with its requisite nourishment."

In illustrating the nature of buds, Dr. S. states a fact very important to florists, namely, that many exotic plants cultivated too luxuriantly in our gardens, never flower or seed as they do in their native soil. A pot of the *Solandra Grandiflora* was accidently left without water in the stove at Kew, in consequence of which the luxuriant growth of its branches was greatly checked, and a flower came forth at the extremity of each. Similar effects may be produced by as simple means. In general, whatever checks the luxuriant production of leaf-buds, favours the formation of flowers and seeds. Whenever Dr. Smith details his own observations on plants, their is a simplicity and perspicuity in his manner, which cannot fail to please. The following observations unfold some of the *curiosa vegetabilia*.

"The economy of the *Sarracenia*, an American genus, of which we now know four species, and of the East Indian *Nepenthes distillatoria*, deserves particular attention. Both grow in bogs, though not absolutely in the water. The former genus has tubular leaves which catch the rain like a funnel and retain it: at least such is the nature of *S. purpurea*, Curt. Mag. t. 849, whose margin seems dilated expressly for this purpose, while the orifice of the tubular part just below is contracted to restrain evaporation. Linnæus conceived this plant to be allied in constitution to *Nymphæa*, and consequently to require a more than ordinary supply of water, which its leaves were calculated to catch and to retain, so as to enable it to live without being immersed in a river or pond. But the consideration of some other

ther species renders this hypothesis very doubtful. *S. flava*, and more especially *S. adunca*, Exot. Bot. t. 53. are so constructed that rain is nearly excluded from the hollow of their leaves, and yet that part contains water, which seems to be secreted by the base of each leaf. What then is the purpose of this unusual contrivance? An observation communicated to me two years ago, in the Botanic garden at Liverpool, seems to unravel the mystery. An insect of the *Sphex* or *Ichneumon* kind, as far as I could learn from the description, was seen by one of the gardeners to drag several large flies to the *Sarracenia adunca*, and, with some difficulty forcing them under the lid or cover of its leaf, to deposit them in the tubular part, which was half filled with water. All the leaves, on being examined, were found crammed with dead or drowned flies. The *S. purpurea* is usually observed to be stored with putrifying insects, whose scent is perceptible as we pass the plant in a garden; for the margin of its leaves is beset with inverted hairs, which, like the wires of a mouse-trap, render it very difficult for any unfortunate fly, that has fallen into the watery tube, to crawl out again. Probably the air evolved by these dead flies may be beneficial to vegetation, and as far as the plant is concerned, its curious construction may be designed to entrap them, while the water is provided to tempt as well as to retain them. The *Sphex* or *Ichneumon*, an insect of prey, stores them up unquestionably for the food of itself or its progeny, probably depositing its eggs in their carcases, as others of the same tribe lay their eggs in various caterpillars, which they sometimes bury afterwards in the ground. Thus a double purpose is answered; nor is it the least curious circumstance of the whole, that an European insect should find out an American plant in a hot-house, in order to fulfil that purpose.

"If the above explanation of the *sarracenia* be admitted, that of the *nepenthes* will not be difficult. Each leaf of this plant terminates in a sort of close-shut tube, like a tankard, holding an ounce or two of water, certainly secreted through the footstalk of the leaf, whose spiral coated vessels are uncommonly large and numerous. The lid of this tube either opens spontaneously, or is easily lifted up by insects, and small worms, who [which] are supposed to resort to these leaves, in search of a purer beverage than the surrounding swamps afford. Rumphius, who has described and figured the plant, says, "various little worms and insects crawl into the orifice, and die in the tube, except a certain small *squilla*, or shrimp, with a protuberant back, sometimes met with, which lives there." I have no doubt that this shrimp feeds on the other insects and worms, and that the same purposes are answered in this instance as in the *sarracenia*; probably the leaves of *Dionæa muscipula*, as well as of the *Droseræ*, Engl. Bot., catch insects for a similar reason." p. 198.

We observe that Dr. S. was not acquainted, when he composed this Introduction, with the ingenious researches of Mr. Ellis on vegetation, otherwise he would not have retained the philosophical fancy of the alternate emission and absorption of

oxygen and carbon by plants. He has also committed some other chemical errors, such as the emission of carbonic acid gas instead of hydrogen gas from water, which is several times repeated. But we have a much more serious objection to some of the observations on "generic names in honour of botanists," particularly on that of *Calomeria*, by a ridiculous pun designed for Buonaparte *in* France, although previously and rationally denominated *Humea*, by Dr. S. himself: and also, the "genus *Bonapartea*, which at least can possibly be admitted only in honour of the *Empress*, and not of her consort, who has no botanical pretensions!!!" As botanists and as men, we confess we could not read this sentence, written by an Englishman too, without blushing for the honourable purity of science, and the interests of society. We disclaim all national or political prejudice as utterly incompatible with the least ray of science, but we should also disclaim and even reprobate science itself, did it ever operate against the interests of genuine morality. How Dr. S. could deliberately ascribe the honour of the name of a botanical genus, to a "common prostitute," whom he is pleased to denominate "empress," we are at a loss to conjecture, unless he wished to render botanical nomenclature truly contemptible to every friend of female virtue. To Napoleon we have not the least objection, if any botanical pander thinks proper to apply his name; but we can assure Dr. S. on the authority of one of the ablest of this same woman's botanists, that however smart in many other respects, she knows *nothing* of botanical *science!* Besides, Madame Beauharnois has no other claim to the title of Buonaparte, than that of being a concubine to a man of that name, as it is certain that no legal union was ever solemnized between them according to the rites of any civilized community. We do therefore appeal to Dr. S. as a truly good moral man, and a christian, to cancel the leaf containing such a name, and thereby avoid every possibility of polluting science, and the chaste minds of Englishwomen, with such abominations. Frenchmen may for a time use such appellations, but most assuredly no other countrymen will. We can likewise, inform Dr. S that he himself, as president of a highly respectable society, greatly underrates his own talents and influence, if he is not convinced of being perfectly able to oppose and repel such a pollution of this pleasing study. We well know the justly high estimation in which his talents and botanical knowledge are held by most of the ablest botanists on the continent, and therefore look to him with confidence to vindicate the science of vegetable life from French prostitution.

The remainder of this clear, scientific, and interesting "Introduction to physiological and systematical Botany," is devoted

to the illustration and emendation of the Linnæan classes and orders, which certainly convey in more intelligible terms a distinct knowledge of the nature, propriety, and uses of this classification, than any other work in our language. Dr. S. discusses the different subjects and describes the most difficult and doubtful distinctions between plants, with all the graceful ease, perspicuity, and completeness of a venerable master, who with parental suavity, condescends to guide young students from the first rudiments to the most curious and complex researches in the economy of vegetable life. Fifteen well engraved plates illustrate the author's verbal remarks; the whole work, indeed, which we are happy to find is only a precursor to a "Systematical English Description of British Plants," on the same principles, is such as might be expected from the talents and experience of the author, and must be ranked as the first, if not the only, introductory treatise on vegetable physiology in the language.

Anecdotes of the Manners and Customs of London, during the Eighteenth Century; including the Charities, Depravities, Dresses, and Amusements of the Citizens of London, during that Period: with a Review of the State of Society in 1807. *To which is added, a Sketch of the Domestic and Ecclesiastical Architecture, and of the various Improvements of the Metropolis.* Illustrated by Fifty Engravings. By James Peller Malcolm, F. S. A. author of "Londinum Redivivum," &c. &c. 4to, pp. 500. 2l. 2s. Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, London, 1808.

WHEN an author, at the commencement of his work, assumes the character of a physician, and prescribes an 'antidote' against expected criticism, it is a sure prognostic that all is not sound within. No writer deprecates observation, or provides a remedy against critical remarks, unless he be himself conscious of some latent weakness in his productions, which even his self-love is insufficient to justify to his own feelings. Mr. Malcom's *antidote*, however, is directed only to those critics who should incline to censure his *arrangement*, whilst those who may be induced to find fault with the propriety of his *selection*, are left to chew the cud in their own way, without any intermixture of proffered sweets to palliate its bitterness. We are not disposed to cavil at immaterial errors, but we think that some blame attaches both to the good taste and to the judgment of Mr. Malcolm, who, in our opinion, has lost a good opportunity of making a far better book.

The introduction, as we have intimated, contains a very laboured attempt to evince that the mode of arranging the sub-

jects of this volume, is the best which could have been adopted. We think otherwise; and are convinced that the classification, even of *anecdotes*, is best calculated to convey information: a judicious juxta-position will always mark the effort of the pen that aims at perspicuity. But let Mr. M. be heard in his own defence:

"By *separating each anecdote*," he observes, "and placing it under the date of the year in which the occurrence happened, I afford the reader an opportunity of observing the *exact progressive state of society* in the period I have selected, without interrupting his ideas with those flourishes and long-polished sentences which are too common in historical works, though very proper in an essay. It must be recollected throughout the perusal of *this work*, that my intention is, a *History of Society in the aggregate*, not a *single* charitable institution, an act of depravity, or a *single custom* or *amusement*: *had it been otherwise*, I should certainly have placed every circumstance relative to each under *one distinct title*." p. 2.

Now we contend, that the very thing which Mr. M. has *neglected* to do, and argues against, is the very thing which he *ought to have done*, to ensure the accomplishment of his own purpose. Every generalization of ideas is an advance in wisdom, provided the data be incontestible. What is history but a *connected chain* of facts. The history of society in the aggregate, we admit, must be compounded from individual occurrences; yet if those occurrences be presented to our view in one mingled tissue of many colours, like the confused representations on glass, which require the aid of catoptrical instruments to restore them to their true forms and dimensions, the faculties of mental vision will be strained too highly, in the attempt to give every particular its appropriate place, for such a task to be undertaken with pleasure; and when pleasure is absent, instruction, we fear, will seldom be communicated. Why has the plan of Dr. Henry's History of England been so generally commended, but from its bringing a vast variety of information into distinct foci. His endeavour was, to separate what, in the natural course of things, and in the wide range of human actions, might, and would be, the production of the same age, and in many cases of the same point of time, but which in themselves had no natural connection with each other; this separation he accomplished, and in so doing, those who enter upon the history of their country by the study of his work, enjoy many advantages, as the mind embraces with far greater readiness those subjects which are presented in detail, and more quickly comprehends their various relations, than when the whole is blended into one mass. A true picture of *society in the aggregate* is not to be

obtained by ranging each anecdote under the date of the year, it must be done by classing all those of similar characters under distinct heads; what ever be the date of their occurrences, or however dissonant the motives of those with whom they originate.

In a general way, we presume, Mr. Malcolm has already felt the force of arguments similar to those we have now advanced, for he has divided his work into twelve chapters, the *contents* of which we shall condense into a few lines: "Persons of the Aborigines of London, with Account of Charities—Anecdotes of Depravity—Manners and Customs—Eccentricities—Methods of raising Money—Popular Tumults—Amusements—Anecdotes of Dress and Fashion—Domestic Architecture and local Arrangements—Ecclesiastical Architecture—Sculpture and Painting, and State of Society." Notwithstanding these helps, the arrangement is too confused, and the volume has altogether the appearance of "a thing of shreds and patches."

We shall now say a few words on the 'selection,' which, in a variety of instances, appears injudicious; yet here Mr. Malcolm may possibly reply in the old adage, that "tastes are not to be disputed:" Granted; but may they not be improved? Many anecdotes in this volume are too trivial and uninteresting to have required repetition: others relate to subjects that cannot possibly be confined to any particular period of time, nor to any state of society; they mark the feelings of mankind in every quarter of the world, and are of course not within the avowed scope of this work. Were they always of importance, however, we should have "no scores to rub off" on that head; but too frequently they occupy space which could have been better filled.

There is one other point, and one only, to which we shall extend our opening remarks. Mr. Malcolm says, that "not a fact related rests upon oral testimony; on the contrary, all are gleaned from the *best* authorities." These authorities, it is admitted, were the "*periodical publications*" lately in the possession of Mr. Nichols, but the entire "matchless collection" of which, we believe, was destroyed in the lamentable fire that consumed the greater part of that gentleman's extensive property. However valuable Mr. Nichols's collection may have been, we must be allowed to hesitate in subscribing to the doctrine of newspapers, intelligencers, and magazines, being the *best authorities*. The foibles, the errors, and the vices of the last age, are proved not to have fallen short of those of the present day, by almost every page of Mr. Malcolm's multifarious volume; and if they did not, there is

assuredly a most evident absurdity in calling those the *best* authorities, which, under a comparative examination, must be found to teem with falsehood and inaccuracy. Let any man of a comprehensive mind, and of extensive information, look over a file of newspapers of any past year of the present century; let him peruse them with attention, and carefully note the gross exaggerations, the mis-statements, the absolute contradictions, and, we must add, the shameful lies, which he will find blazoned forth in all the confidence of truth, and he will then possess a pretty accurate knowledge of what that writer must hazard, who having made his selection from the same sources at the expiration of fifty or one hundred years, shall come forward and say, "thus have I done, and I challenge contradiction:—mine are the *best authorities!*" That Mr. Malcolm would *intentionally* pervert a single fact, or make one statement that he *believed* to be erroneous, we certainly have not the most distant idea of intimating; he possesses too high a sense of honour, too great a feeling of manly integrity, even to permit the supposition. What we have said, therefore, he will regard as written in the full spirit of moral honesty, and without any other view than that of showing the impropriety of making general assertions on controvertible testimony.

In the opening of the first chapter, Mr. Malcolm draws an imaginary picture of the persons of the Londoners from the rude ages of the aboriginal times, to the artful refinements of the present day. In this picture, to use the phraseology of the art, we find a sort of meretricious colouring which catches with its glare, but will not bear examining: there is a want, too, both of ordonnance and of keeping; and for the sake of a contrast, deep shadows and strong lights have been introduced, without the requisite attention to harmony and repose. To drop the metaphor, we think that the language of this attempt at personal character, is somewhat inflated, and that the ideas are not always in accordance with historical fact. We, grey beards though we be, can still feel and acknowledge the form of beauty, yet our powers of discrimination must either be much blunted, or those of our author far *above par*, for we candidly confess, that of the "thousands of Grecian Apollos and Venuses, [of London] who appear to have been nursed by the Graces," we know nothing. That the metropolis can furnish many beautiful figures, both male and female, from the millions of its inhabitants, we readily allow, but that perfection of form and character, which characterizes an Apollo and a Venus, has but few, very few resemblances.

Nearly fifty pages in the first chapter are taken up with an enumeration of charitable institutions, and accounts of individual charities during the first eighty years of the last century. British benevolence, though always operating, is not always sufficiently active, as the following dreadful narration proves. Who, indeed, could imagine that scenes so extremely calamitous could ever happen in the very heart, as it were, of the metropolis.

"Though so much had been done to prevent the calamities of poverty, wretchedness prevailed in places where benevolence could not imagine it existed. Garrets in retired alleys and lanes always afford inmates in the last stages of disease and starvation; and the instances that might be adduced, would prove very distressing in the recital; but that *supposed empty houses* should contain wretches expiring with want, was beyond the imagination of the most exalted charity; and yet the following melancholy fact actually occurred in November 1763, the narrative of which may serve as a hint to overseers, whose duty, I should conceive it is, to prevent actual *death through want* in their respective districts.

"A Mr. Stephens, of Fleet-market, was commissioned to show some empty houses in Stonecutter-street intended for sale, and one day accompanied a gentleman to them, who had thoughts of purchasing the estate on which they were situated. On entering a room on the first floor, an object of horror attracted their attention, *a naked female corpse!* Stephens, alarmed beyond expression, fled from the scene; but the other more courageous ascended to the next floor, where he was soon after joined by his terrified attendant, and they discovered a second and third woman dead, and nearly destitute of clothing. pursuing this dreadful research, they found in the upper story two women, and a girl about eighteen years of age, one of whom, and the latter, appeared emaciated beyond description, but their companion in misery was in better condition. Prudence and humanity dictated that an examination should take place as to the cause of so singular and dreadful an occurrence; in consequence, the survivors were taken into custody, and the ensuing particulars were related by them before the coroner and his jury.

"It appeared on the inquisition, from the evidence of Elizabeth Stanton, one of these women, that on the Wednesday preceding the inquiry she came from Westminster, and being in want of lodging, strolled to this house, and laid herself down on the ground floor, where she saw nobody; that about eleven that evening the woman in good condition (Elizabeth Pattent) a stranger to her, came into the room where she (Stanton) had laid herself down, and by treading on her awakened her, at the same time crying out 'Who is there?' To which Stanton replied, 'No person that will hurt you, for that she was going away in the morning.' Pattent therefore advised her to go up to the garret with her, which she did, and stayed there all that night, and the following day and night, and until she was taken into custody in the garret upon the above discovery.

"Pattent, being out of place, attended the Fleet-market as a basket-woman; where she became acquainted with the deceased women, who were basket-women, and both known by no other names than Bet. Pattent, being destitute of lodging, was recommended to this ruinous house by the deceased women, who had lived, or rather starved, there for some time. Pattent, in the day-time, used to go to her late mistress's, who kept a cook's shop in King-street, Westminster, and worked for her victuals, and lodged in this house at night, where she continued till she was taken into custody. About the middle of the week preceding the inquisition, the deceased women were taken ill; and on Saturday the 12th instant, Pattent pawned her apron for sixpence, and bought some beef and plumb pudding at a cook's shop in Shoe-lane, and both the deceased women on Saturday and Sunday ate heartily thereof, and on Sunday night she heard the deceased women groan. One had the itch, and the other a fever; and, being fearful of catching the one or the other, she did not go to them any more; nor did she know of their deaths till taken into custody.

"Elizabeth Surman, the girl, was the daughter of a deceased jeweller, in Bell-alley, Coleman-street; her parents died when she was about six years of age, and she was taken care of by Mrs. Jones, a next-door neighbour, with whom she lived about four years; Mrs. Jones then dying, Surman was left destitute; and on being informed she could get employment in Spitalfields, she went there, and assisted a woman in winding quills, but she retiring into the country, Surman was again left destitute; however, she found employment in Spitalfields market, with Mrs. Bennet, in winding silk, but, not pleasing her, was discharged in a week. She then went to Mrs. Roach's in that market, who took in washing and nursed children, where Surman continued six years, and until she was taken ill, on which account she was discharged her service. She then went to the churchwarden of the parish where her father had been housekeeper many years, to desire relief; *but he refused, without so much as expostulating with her about her legal settlement, or informing her that she had gained a settlement by servitude.* She being very ill and weak, *lay all night at the churchwarden's door, but it had no effect on him;* and this girl was obliged to lie about in the streets, until she was informed of this empty house, where she lay every night for near two months; the deceased women being there when she came, and both then lying on straw in the two pair of stairs room. For the first week of Surman's being there, she lay in the room with them on straw, all which week *she was ill with an ague, and had no sustenance* whatever; *that then Elizabeth Pattent relieved her;* and as Surman grew better, she went abroad and received alms, returning at night, and delivering her money to Pattent, who bought her victuals. Surman was afterwards received into St. Andrew's workhouse, where she continued a week; and, about a fortnight ago, she returned to this empty house, and lodged in the garret; and being very ill, *was assisted by Pattent*, and for the last fortnight was not out of the garret till last Friday, when she, with the two other women, were found

in the garret and taken into custody, and never saw or heard, all that time, any thing of the deceased women till she was apprehended.

"On Pattent's being interrogated with respect to the woman's being stripped naked and selling her clothes, she strictly denied knowing any thing of it; alleging, that as they all entered the house at the cellar, and she being mostly out in the day time, and attending the poor girl at night, other persons might strip the deceased unknown to her. There were no marks of violence about the deceased women, *but they appeared as if starved.* The jury were well satisfied with the account they had received from their most deplorable evidence. The coroner gave them some money; and the jury ordered them a supper, and that care might be taken of them in the casualty house."

(To be continued.)

DIVINITY.

A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex, at the Visitation in May and June 1808. By (the Reverend) George Owen Cambridge, A. M. F. A. S. Archdeacon of Middlesex and Prebendary of Ely, 8vo. p.p. 34. Cadell and Davies.

THE persevering and well directed exertions of Mr. Cambridge, in discharge of the duties of his important office, for important is the office of archdeacon, in every point of view, entitle him to the thanks, not only of his own archdeaconry, but of the whole protestant public. In this sensible and impressive charge, he points out the evils, to the correction and removal of which, his attention has been directed. The repair of churches, the keeping them in clean and decent state, the providing comfortable accommodations for the poor, the increase of the salaries of parish clerks, and the appointment of proper persons to fill that situation,—these and various other points, connected with the decorous performance of religious duties, are temperately and earnestly enforced on the minds of his clergy, by this worthy archdeacon.

There is one matter to which very little attention has been generally paid, though it is of considerable consequence, that is, the propriety of planting trees for timber, in glebe land, by which means, in the course of time, sufficient timber may be produced for all the necessary repairs of the parsonage house. If every patron of a living were to make it a condition with the incumbent, whom he appoints to it, that he should plant, within a given time, a certain number of trees, the object would soon be attained.

On the growth of Sectarism, and of some of the causes of it, the archdeacon makes judicious observations.

"When we consider the state of the large parishes in the western parts of the metropolis, and its immediate vicinity, it is a natural and very probable conclusion to make, that this immense and rapid increase of population, must have proved injurious to the interests of the established church, whilst it has afforded favourable aid to the views of the sectaries; although the force of this observation is in

some degree weakened, by the too frequent instances, that occur, of their having obtained a footing, and established themselves with unlooked-for success, in places where no such excuse can be offered for their admission, nor for the conduct of those misguided persons, who flock to these new and unaccredited teachers, in preference to their own national church, and lawful ministers, still, I have no hesitation in pronouncing, from all I have been able to observe myself, or collect from others, that great and important benefits would follow, and that many who now wander away from the fold, might be induced to return if better accommodation could be provided, and more effectual encouragement given, in these very extensive and crowded parishes, to the middle and lower classes of the inhabitants to frequent the worship of the established church, by the erection of free churches, where they are required, or else by allotting to them a larger share of accommodation in the churches and chapels already established, by such means as circumstances should point out."

We have very often enforced the necessity of erecting free churches in the metropolis, for the use of the poor; and it is lamentable to see, that while thousands and tens of thousands are lavished on objects of convenience or amusement, or an institution of comparatively trifling importance, not a sixpence is appropriated, in this Christian country, to a purpose so essential to the diffusion of religious knowledge amongst the indigent classes of the community.—The author's concluding reflections on the proper conduct of a parish priest, and on its beneficial consequences, prove that Mr. Cambridge has formed a most correct estimate of the clerical character.

Female Benefit Societies recommended; or the Necessity and Advantages of Foresight; A Sermon preached in the parish Church of St. Saviour, in the City of York, on the first of June, 1808, *before the York Female Benefit club, established in* 1801, *(and published at the Request of the Patronesses)*, by the Rev. John Graham, Rector of St. Saviour, and of St. Mary, York, 4to. p.p. 20. 1s. 6d. York printed; Rivingtons, London, 1808.

The principle on which the various societies throughout this kingdom were established, namely, for the formation of a fund, from a small portion of the earnings of the healthy and the able, for the relief of the sick, the infirm, and the aged, is unexceptionably good; and were the plan of such societies strictly adhered to, the most beneficial consequences would infallibly result from them, as well to the individual members, as to the community at large. Where, indeed, persons of character and respectability, as at York, take the trouble of superintending them, and they cannot perform a more charitable act, or render a much greater service to society, than by directing their attention to such objects, the most solid advantages have been produced. But in the metropolis and its vicinity, which contain, we suspect, many more of these clubs, than all the other portions of the united kingdom together, benefit societies, instead of answering the purposes of their institution, have become the instruments of peculation and fraud. When a member becomes chargeable

to the society, the relief to which he is entitled is, in very many instances, withholden on the most frivolous and dishonest pretexts. And when an appeal is made to magistrates, and reparation to the injured party ordered, the members will sooner dissolve the society, than comply with the injunction. In short, instead of benefits, they have become evils, and unless the legislature interpose its timely aid, for the correction of existing abuses, the societies will only afford means to the artful to dupe these unwary. The causes of this horrible perversion of a most excellent institution, are too numerous to be detailed here. One or two of them, however it is proper to relate. According to the present regulation, all the male societies meet at public houses, where, by their rules, they are obliged to spend a certain sum, to indemnify the publican for the use of his room, and it may easily be conceived that when benevolent meetings are thus converted into convivial assemblies, the members are not much disposed to limit themselves to the expenditure of the sum specified in the articles. Hence dissipation and debauchery, are encouraged in societies, which cannot exist without the strict observance of regularity and economy. Every society too, has a clerk, a very needless kind of appendage, who receives a certain sum from every member, and whose time is chiefly employed in devising means for evading the payment of money, to persons entitled to receive it. So lucrative an office is that of clerk to a benefit society, that there are men who devote their whole time to the purpose of obtaining it, and who spend a great deal of money for the establisment of new clubs, to which they act in that capacity. Indeed the same arts of puffing by hand bills and other means, are used to induce persons to become members, as are employed by the contractors for the state lottery, to promote the sale of their tickets. And one man, we have heard, has been so successful in this trade, for a trade it literally is, as to have established no less than two hundred benefit clubs. These circumstances alone are sufficient to prove the existence of great abuses in the management of the clubs, and the necessity of adopting some measure for their removal. Most of the *articles*, which constitute the laws of the societies, are drawn up in a most careless and slovenly manner, and, not unfrequently, contain very improper and pernicious clauses; as these have no validity, until they have received the sanction of the quarter sessions, and have been regularly enrolled there, it is much to be wished that the magistrates would pay very particular attention to the rules before they consent to give them the validity of laws. The proper mode of proceeding, would be to appoint a committee, to whom all such rules should be referred, when they might undergo a proper investigation, which they never do, or can receive in open court. It sometimes happens, that a member appealing to magistrates (out of session) for relief, has his claim defeated by the neglect to enroll the artciles. One article is generally inserted, which, though its evident object be to prevent litigation, has the effect of encouraging injustice, by making men judges in their own causes. Instead of the appeal to magistrates, allowed by the general act, the article alluded to directs that all disputes shall be settled by arbi-

tration, the complainant to appoint one member of the society as his arbiter, the society at large to appoint another, and those two to name a third as umpire, whose award is to be final. Now in this case, where a party claims relief which the society refuse, (and this is almost the only ground of dispute which becomes the subject of arbitration) that the three members who are ultimately to decide on the justice of the claim, are all immediately interested in rejecting it, because, if allowed, the amount of it would be paid out of a fund of which they are joint proprietors. It may, indeed, be supposed, that the judges could be induced to render impartial justice by the consideration that the case, on which they are called to decide, might one day be their own. But besides that a contingent and remote interest is never, or at least rarely found to affect the human mind so deeply, as a certain and present interest, this supposition stands contradicted by the experience of facts.

There are many other evils attendant upon the present mode of conducting benefit societies in the metropolis, and within the bills of mortality, which we have neither time nor room to notice here, we could not, however, refrain from pointing out some specific abuses, that the justice of our opinion, an opinion founded on attentive observation and long experience, with opportunities for both, possessed by few, might not be impeached; and in the hope that some efficacious means will speedily be adopted for restoring these institutions to their original principles.

The enormous amount of poor rates in this country, while it demonstrates the existence of some radical defect in the system, and is pregnant with consequences of the most alarming nature to the state, renders every scheme which has a tendency to diminish them, of primary importance to the community. And assuredly, no scheme was ever devised, that was so well calculated to produce this effect, as the establishment of benefit societies. They are, therfore, great objects of public attention, and of legislative cognizance.

The respectable author of the sermon before us will not deem these observations either digressive or impertinent; his own zealous and praiseworthy exertions have been so long, and so ably, directed to the same point, that, we are persuaded, we cannot render him a more acceptable service, than by indicating defects which require a remedy, and abuses which call for correction. In the female societies, indeed, these abuses, do not prevail to the same extent; though too many instances of similar acts of injustice, (we speak of the clubs in the capital) occur even there.

In this sensible discourse, Mr. Graham explains the great advantages of female societies; and suggests many useful hints for their improvement. We forbear to quote any part of it, because we earnestly recommend the perusal of the discourse itself, to all readers who interest themselves in such subjects; and we are convinced, they will be the more readily disposed to purchase it, when informed, that the profits of the sale are devoted, by the benevolent preacher, to the increase of the funds of that excellent society before which it was delivered.

Youth addressed, the Substance of a Sermon preached at Fulham Church, in the Afternoon of Sunday, the 25th of September, 1808, in reference to certain recent Occurrences among the Youths of the Parish and Vicinity. By the Rev. John Owen, M. A. Curate of Fulham, and Rector of Pugglesham, Essex.

THE occurrences referred to in this sermon, are the premature deaths of four individuals; one a female child, only in her ninth year, who, labouring under a fatal disease, and fully sensible of her approaching dissolution, displayed a degree of piety and resignation, which would have been honourable to a veteran member of the church of Christ; two others, a young man and woman, tenderly attached to each other, who perished in a boat on the Thames, which sunk in a moment, close to the shore, and within sight of a number of persons; and one youth of nineteen, who, having fallen into bad company, had become corrupted and debauched, and committed suicide, in a place open to public observation. These awful events have supplied the ground-work of a very eloquent and instructive lesson, which Mr. Owen has enforced, with equal ability and zeal; strongly impressing on the minds of the youthful part of his congregation, to whom principally the sermon was addressed, the indispensable necessity of remembering their Creator in the days of their youth.

The observations on the propriety of early instilling religious principles into the minds of youth, and on the propensity of youth to treat religion with contempt, are highly impressive. If we have any thing like an objection to the sermon, it applies to the language, which is very eloquent, but rather, in some parts of the discourse, above the comprehension, we should suppose, of the younger part of such a mixed congregation, as that to which it was addressed.

A Sermon preached at a Country Church, Nov. 8. 1807, on the 5th verse of the 93d Psalm, "Holiness becometh thine house, O Lord, for ever," adapted to a Country Congregation. 8vo. p.p. 30. 1s. 6d. Williams, 1808.

A PLAIN well-intentioned discourse, on the necessity of prayer, and of a devout conduct during attendance on divine worship, illustrated by a reference to the strictness observed by pagans in the worship of their false gods, and, more appropriately, by scriptural admonitions and precepts.

POETRY.

Ode to Iberia. By Eyles Irwin, Esq. M. R. I. A. 4to. pp. 16. Asperne, 1808.

NEVER did nobler subject warm the muse, than wronged Iberia's cause! Every tongue, every pen, every impulse of the heart, every effort of the mind, every exertion of the hand, should be directed to this common object, to aid the great cause of liberty, of patriotism, of virtue; 'tis the last struggle of expiring freedom, and, on the result

of the present contest, in Spain, depends nothing less, than the restoration of civil liberty to the continent of Europe, or the annihilation of every vestige of freedom. If the French prevail, which, may Heaven in its mercy prevent, Europe will be again plunged into a state of the most abject slavery, and a long and dreary night of impenetrable darkness, will be spread over the fairest portion of the earth.

Mr. Irwin's patriotic muse speaks to the heart, and the judgment cannot stoop to investigate the justice of her prophetic strains, lest the result should cast a damp on the most generouse emotions of the human mind.

That the following prediction may be speedily verified, must be the devout wish of every friend to liberty.

" If ever tyrant, steep'd in blood,
Thro' Conquest's splendid reign;
On *Jaffa's* sands, or NILUS' flood,
JENA, or FRIEDLAND'S plain,

Was 'circled in the toils of fate,
'Tis NAPOLEON, termed falsely great!

His sand runs out, his glories fail,
And nations, SPANIARD-like, deceiv'd,
Of every hope, but death bereav'd,
Press round to grace his fall!"

To all this we devoutly say AMEN.

The Stanzas of an English Friend to the Patriots of Spain. 4to. pp. 20. Westley and Co. 1808.

MANY of these stanzas are truly poetical, and the bard displays a considerable portion of judgment, as well as of genius, though these qualities are not often united in the same mind. He foresees the difficulties which the Spaniards will have to subdue, and the obstacles they will have to encounter; and he exhorts them to perseverance though death should be the consequence. The two following stanzas will serve as a fair specimen of the whole.

" BRITAIN, in brave compassion blest,
To succour fortitude opprest,
Her strength, her blood, with generous ardour, yields:
She views thee, SPAIN, with proud applause,
Kindles to rapture in thy cause,
And while thy shores her guardian navy shields,
Her sons would usher thine to Fame's sublimest fields.

" To keep the brittle gift of life,
And conquer in the noblest strife,
Heaven to the brave and virtuous, may deny;
Yet, if his duty be fulfill'd,
A Briton's heart is never chill'd:
Tho' on a foreign soil his limbs may lie,
Dying in Freedom's cause, he still exults to die."

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain displayed in a Series of select Engravings, with an historical and descriptive Account of each Subject. By John Britton, F. S. A. Parts x. xi. xii. xiii. 4to. 10s. 6d. each. Longman and Co. 1807, 1808.

THE first three of these parts are devoted to the superb Chapel of Henry the Seventh; the descriptive plates are numerous, and executed with the usual ability displayed by the artists whom Mr. Britton has engaged to supply the embellishments for this valuable work.—The thirteenth part contains views of five old mansions, namely, an *Old House* at Islington; *Audley-End* in Essex; *Holland House* in Middlesex; *Compton Winyate House* in Warwickshire; and *Charlton House* in Wiltshire. We are happy to find that Mr. Britton does not relax in his antiquarian labours and researches; and that every fresh number of his work exhibits proofs of increased efforts to render it worthy, in all respects, of public patronage.

A short Account of the late Mr. Richard Porson, M. A. Greek Professor of Trinity College, Cambridge, with some few Particulars relative to his extraordinary Talents. By an Admirer of great Genius. 8vo. pp. 23. Baldwins. 1808.

ANY authentic account of so extraordinary a character as Professor Porson, cannot fail to prove highly interesting to the classical and literary world; and the author of this brief sketch has proved himself to be so well qualified for his task, that we lament he has not been tempted to fill up the outline which he has drawn, and to supply the public with a whole length biographical portrait. He is not only an admirer, but an able and discriminating judge, of genius; and he evidently possesses no small portion of that genius, of that classical taste, and of that critical acumen which he so justly admires in the departed Professor. He leaves to others to declare the name of the old lady who first taught Mr. Porson to read, and to ascertain, from authority, that he was taken from the plough, as Demosthenes is said to have been taken from the forge. He dates his account of him at the period when Porson's first patron died, and he was thrown on the world, till taken up by Sir George Baker, who, with the assistance of the Townshend family, procured a subscription of sufficient amount to purchase 80l. a year in the short annuities. This sum was devoted to his support at Eton, and, afterwards, at Cambridge.

Many interesting anecdotes, illustrative of the temper, disposition, and humour, of the Professor, are here related; one of which only we shall allow ourselves to extract.

"Whenever the name of Porson has been mentioned, he has been mostly praised for his memory; but other scholars may perhaps be quoted, who have not fallen very short of him in this particular." (We know at this moment a youth at Westminster school, whose memory is at least as extraordinary as the Professor's was.) "Scarce any, however, can be found, who have professed the extraordinary talent of retaining every thing which they have ever read, and carrying it about with them, and bringing it out, *à point nommé*, in all states and conditions, whether sick or sorry, as Porson showed in numberless instances that he could do, almost even to his latest breath: and probably none who, to a memory uncommonly accurate, have formed a judgment so remarkably sound, and singularly acute, with a nice discernment of every defect, and an exquisite taste for every beauty. Of all this, proofs are in every body's hands; his stupendous memory is in every scholar's recollection; his powers of argument, and critical acumen, live in the heavenly witnesses; and his taste is shown in his Greek and English compositions; to say nothing of his elegant and nervous Latin style, his penetrating eye, and his matchless penmanship: here, indeed, he thought himself surpassed by Dr. Young, not in the stroke, but the sweep of his letters. And all this he retained generally under very trying circumstances; for if, at any time, his body was disguised by excess, (and who does not, occasionally, in something or other, break the golden rule of the quidnuncs?) his mind was less clouded, his recollection more perfect, his eye quicker, and his mind steadier, to say the least, than any other man's in the same circumstances.

"His company was, as may well be supposed, eagerly courted by all ranks, from the combination-room to the cider-cellar; for he mixed with all, and was to be found in both; and it was who should assist at his evening lectures, and who should carry away most from the oracle. But sometimes it so happened, as it does to all, that the priest was sulky, and pulling a book out of his pocket, read only to himself; sometimes he was violent, and catching the poker out of the fire, brandished it over his head, to the terror of the company; of this trick, however, he was cured, once for all, by a name of fighting notoriety, who, on seeing Porson seize the poker, and not being used to a furious Greek, but in the play, snatched the tongs, observing, that two could play at that game; upon which the Professor, with a sneer of his own, said, "I believe, If I should crack your skull I should find it very empty." "And if I should break your head," replied the Irishman, "I should find it full of maggots." This good natured remark pleased the Professor so much, that he returned the poker to the fire, and repeated a whole chapter of Roderic Random, analogous to the business. Upon another occasion, the Professor, having spent an evening at a friend's house a little way out of town, where he arrived completely wet through, was brought the next morning to visit his friend's neighbour, who had a learned library, and a house full of books, and after apologizing for his dress and his shoes, which were not his own, but supplied, with the rest of his clothes, by his companion, and quoting Horace in two places for the

awkwardness or inconvenience of a shoe too tight, or too loose, and Theophrastus, and Theocritus, he provoked one of the company to observe, that the way to make the greatest expedition was to run, as the French, and the Dutch, and the Scotch women do, with their slippers in their hands, when they are pressed for time; and cited Æschylus, where it is said in the Prometheus, "I hurried out of the carriage without sandals;" upon which the Professor started upon his feet, and fired, as a strict sportsman does who hears a strange gun in the preserves which he keeps for his own shooting. No sooner were the these words pronounced, than he gave Stanley's comment and parallel passages upon them; for such was the local mechanism of his memory, that mention a line in any classic, and he would not only tell which side of the page it was on, but the previous and subsequent clause. But to proceed: he quoted a similar passage from Bion, which consisting of a broken line, a whole verse, and a broken one, he made the most of them, and thundered them out with a menacing gesture, and a strong emphasis on the last words, "without sandals." The person who had innocently begun this carping match, and had never seen Porson before in a room, was struck with the earnestness of his manner, and apparent displeasure, and determined neither to give up, nor sit still, but to follow the Professor, and do as he did; he therefore, too, stood on his legs and roared out, in the words of the next quotation in Stanley, from Theocritus, "Arise, nor stay to put your sandals on your feet." The Professor was startled at finding his opponent on the same ground with himself, and so near at his heels; but, doubting if it were not by mere accident, he took the next passage from Horace that followed in the commentators, to which he added the remark of Stanley, that concludes his note, namely, that water-nymphs went unshod; and for that reason Homer gives Thetis the epithet of silver-footed. Here the Professor had, as usual, the last word, for he was in the habit of seeing every body and every thing out."

It is a lamentable thing that all the Professor's learning and genius were not accompanied by a quality without which neither preferment nor comfort is to be expected in this life. Nullum numen abest, si adsit prudentia; and where prudence is not, the highest qualifications are, comparatively, of little importance. With a mind so gifted, so endowed, as was Porson's, he ought to have attained to distinction and opulence; instead of which he yielded to a propensity which led him into company, and habits and pursuits utterly unworthy of him, while it rendered his literary attainments of no avail.

The author of this lively sketch expresses his belief that the licentious parody of Pope's Eloisa to Abelard, which has lately made some noise, and has been generally ascribed to Porson, was written by his friend Mr. Coffin of Exeter; and that the fondness which the Professor displayed for it was the fondness of adoption.

Petit Tableau, ou Elémens de la Constitution, des Lois, du Gouvernement, &c. du Royaume-Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande. Mis à la portée des jeunes Gens, avec l'Explication des Mots les plus difficiles en Anglois au bas de chaque page Par N. Wanostrocht, Docteur en Droit, &c. pp. 259. 12mo. 4s. 6d. bound. Vernor, Hood, and Co. 1805-8.

ALL those who have ever visited the Continent of Europe, or travelled in foreign countries, must have frequently been asked questions relative to the British constitution and laws, which they were often embarrassed to satisfactorily answer. To such persons the present little volume will be a most grateful acquisition; and in recommending it not only to their attentive perusal, but also to youth determined to travel, or desirous of possessing an accurate general knowledge of the laws of England, we render them a service which they will remember for its utility. It would far exceed our limits to enumerate all the different titles which are explained in this work on the rights, civil and criminal laws, tenures, commerce, and institutions of Great Britain, which amount to several hundreds. The author acknowledges his obligations to Mr. Bowles, one of the first constitutional writers of the age; and it is sufficiently evident that no foreigner alone could have arranged and digested such a variety of facts on the constitution and laws of this country. To foreigners, or to English, either studying or knowing the French language, this "View, or Elements of the Constitution, Laws, and Government of the United Kingdom," will be found one of the most useful and instructive works in any language, as it contains those principles of polity which sooner or later will become the basis of all the laws in Europe.

A Collection of modern and contemporary Voyages and Travels; containing Translations from foreign Languages of Voyages and Travels never before published; Original Voyages and Travels never before published; an Analysis of New Voyages and Travels published in England; about 700 Pages each Volume, with Maps and Plates. Phillips, 1805-8.

SEVEN volumes of this useful work have already appeared in monthly numbers, which we shall examine at greater length as they become more recent. The first volume contains "Cassas's Travels in Istria and Dalmatia," translated from the French; "Kütner's Travels through Denmark, Sweden, Austria, and part of Italy, in 1798 and 1799," translated from the German; and "Michaux's Travels to the Westward of the Allegany Mountains," in America, in 1802, translated from the French; an original "Itinerary from London to Constantinople in 60 days," in 1794; Analysis of "Captain Woodward's Narrative;" "Kotzebue's Journey from Berlin to Paris;" and "Tuckey's Voyage to New South Wales." The reader will find much curious and useful information in this volume respecting Denmark, Sweden, and Austria; and also Istria and Dalmatia, which

are very likely to become the theatre of war immediately after that in Spain may be terminated or suspended. As these Travels bear internal evidence of being genuine, and are in general sufficiently well translated, we have no hesitation in recommending them as forming one of the most entertaining and cheapest publications now before the public. Their present circulation, we believe, is greatly inferior to their obvious merit, which considerably surpasses most of the other works published by the same bookseller. The volumes, though closely printed, are very distinct, and comprise much information in a small compass.

Anniversary Oration, delivered March 8, 1808, *before the Medical Society of London, on the general Structure and Physiology of Plants compared with those of Animals, and the mutual Convertibility of their organic Elements. Published at the unanimous request of the Society, by J. Mason Good, F.R.S.* pp. 60. 8vo Longman and Co. 1808.

QUIN et caudicibus sectis, mirabile dictu! "*Mutual* convertibility of their organic elements!"— This is what our orator and "senior secretary to the Medical Society," no doubt, calls philosophy; be it so—it is not *science.* This "anniversary oration" may be very correctly estimated by the letters appended to the orator's name, F. R. S. *i. e. Folly Reigns Supreme.*

Theodore, or the Peruvians. From the French of Pigault le Brun. By E. W. pp. 160, small 8vo. 4s. 6d Crosby and Co. 1808.

ONE of the most pleasing and interesting little tales we have lately seen, and greatly superior to any thing we would have expected from P. le Brun. It is in general well translated, and there is a happy delicacy of sentiment which pervades it, as if coming from a female pen. From the vulgar idea of Peru, there are too many "golden" scenes, but these are not such as materially affect the general simplicity and interest of the tale.

National Life Annuities; comprising all the Tables, and every necessary Information contained in the Act of Parliament for granting the same, both on single and joint Lives, with benefit of Survivorship; also additional Tables, annexed to the former throughout, calculated to show what Annuity can be purchased for 100*l. sterling at the same Rates upon the same Lives.* By E. F. T. Fortune, Stock Broker. pp. 96, 8vo. 3s 6d. Boosey, 1808.

THE utility of these tables and explanation to annuitants and persons possessing property in the funds, is self-evident, and it will be found a very convenient and necessary appendage to the Act of Parliament, as it contains many *original and useful tables.*—The abstract appears sufficiently explanatory.

REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

Professor Vince's Essay on Gravitation and the Edinburgh Review.

According to Sir I. Newton's hypothesis, the force with which a planet is urged towards the sun, is the difference between the pressures of the fluid on the sides next and opposite to the sun. The pressures on those half surfaces (as the density of the fluid continually varies) can only be found by a fluxional calculus; and upon examining the Professor's solution, it appears to be perfectly satisfactory. Now the Reviewer makes the pressure towards the sun to be as the fluxion of the density; this is *manifestly* false. If a series of quantities increase according to any law, is the difference of the first and last terms the same as the difference between the sums of the first half and the second half of the series? For something of this kind must have entered into the mind of the Reviewer, if he had any meaning at all in what he has stated. Further, the fluxion of the density of the fluid is independent of the density of the planet, and yet in estimating the force of the planet to the sun, the density of the planet necessarily enters into the calculation, the accelerative force being as the moving force divided by the quantity of matter in the planet, or by its magnitude and density conjointly. These palpable blunders into which the Reviewer has fallen, can be imputed only to his total ignorance of the subject. Besides the absurdity of Le Sage's hypothesis, it is not found, as asserted by the Reviewer, that any too bodies will be urged towards each other by forces varying inversely as the squares of their distances. We have noticed two strong propensities in these Reviewers; one, that of endeavouring to discover errors where there are none, and to conceal merit where there is any; the other, to make their review a vehicle for propagating their own opinions.

POLITICS.

IT would be premature, at this moment, to deliver our final opinion of the facts and circumstances relative to the late convention of Cintra, which came out in the course of the examinations before the court of Inquiry. It is sufficient for us to observe, at present, that by a reference to our former observations, on that calamitous event, our readers will find that we did not speak lightly nor unadvisedly; but that we have been fully borne out in all our leading remarks by the testimony of the officers who were concerned in the transaction. It is now established by the admission of Sir Harry Burrard himself, that Sir Arthur Wellesley did most strenuously advise him, again

and again, to pursue the flying enemy, after the battle of Vimiera, and there can scarcely remain a doubt, in the mind of any man who has read the proceedings of the court of Inquiry, that, had this advice been followed, the French army must have been either destroyed or compelled to surrender at discretion. In either of these events, the beneficial consequences which must have ensued to the common cause, would have been incalculable. Our army would have sailed for Spain, flushed with conquest, and bearing the honourable spoils of victory. They would have reached the scene of action by sea much more expeditiously than by a tedious march through a difficult country, and prepared to reap fresh laurels for themselves, and to infuse fresh spirits into the minds of the gallant Spaniards. They would have landed, too, at the same point, with the troops from England, and, thus forming one compact and powerful army, they might have directed their united efforts to any point where their services were required, and have acted with consistency and effect. Instead of which, by pursuing the course which, in consequence of the convention of Cintra, they were compelled to pursue, they underwent the fatigues of a long and painful march, and lost much valuable time, in establishing and maintaining a communication with the division from England under General Baird, which might, and ought to, have been, employed in active operations against the enemy.

The humility which Sir Harry Burrard has displayed, would, independently of more imperious motives, arising out of a deep regard for the principles of justice, prevent us from making any severe animadversions on his conduct. He pleads an earnest desire to promote the honour of his sovereign, and the success of his country's arms, as the *motive*, and an *error in judgment*, as an *extenuation*, of his conduct. We give him full credit for both his pleas, and as far as they can be allowed to operate in such a case, we wish him to enjoy the full benefit of them. But error in judgment implying an incapacity for the situation which he holds, is no legal or available excuse for conduct injurious to the honour and interests of the country, either in a minister or a general. When a situation of importance, involving both serious responsibility, and the welfare of a state, is offered to a man, he should weigh, with all the impartiality which self-love, that passion which providence has, for the wisest purposes, planted in the human heart, will allow him to exercise, his qualifications for the proffered post. If he be not qualified for it, and still

accept it, he ought to be punished for his temerity; for the consequences to his country are the same, whether the injury which it has sustained, arise from ignorance or intention, from a wish to do wrong, or from an error in judgment. For military men, indeed, an allowance is to be made, which politicians have no right to claim. They are, in a certain degree, compelled to accept any command, to which their sovereign may be pleased to appoint them; and, of all men, it can be least expected from them, that they should plead unfitness for the situation, which must arise out of that want of knowledge which it is their duty to acquire, as a cause for refusing to accept it. If, indeed, we be not misinformed, Sir Harry Burrard himself was far from feeling that pleasure, which the appointment of an officer to a chief command, on an important station, generally communicates. We have even heard, that his surprise and concern upon the occasion were equally great, and that he took no pains to conceal them; nay, that, with a rare modesty, he expressed his wish that some one of the many generals who were better qualified for such a situation, had been appointed to fill it, instead of himself. We are only surprised, that, with such feelings, he did not place a sufficient reliance on the superior judgment of Sir Arthur Wellesley, to follow the advice which he enforced with so much earnestness, immediately after the victory of Vimiera; advice, too, so decidedly seconded by another able officer, General Ferguson. As it is, however, Sir Harry Burrard stands in a delicate, and an awful predicament. It is not for us to anticipate the further proceedings which, we take it for granted, will be instituted; much less, the sentence of the court-martial, which, it appears to us, must be called to pronounce ultimately on his conduct.

Though the confession of Sir Harry Burrard has taken no small portion of blame from Sir Hew Dalrymple, still there are parts of Sir Hew's conduct respecting the terms of the convention, and the mode of conducting it, which rested solely with himself, that demand further investigation, and call for the specific decision of a competent tribunal. If, and we beg to be understood as putting a mere *hypothetical* case, the imprudent conduct of Sir Harry Burrard had rendered it adviseable to enter into some agreement with the French, for the evacuation of the country, was the convention of Cintra such as, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, he was justified in concluding? We have no hesitation to give a negative answer to this

question, for we will contend, in the face of all the jurists and politicians in Europe, that some of the conditions were such as the sovereign of these realms himself had no right to subscribe; and, consequently, as no officer holding his commission, and exercising a delegated power, could be justified in giving them the weight and authority of his sanction.

It seems now to be the prevailing opinion, the justice of which no attempt has, as we know, been yet made to impeach, that neither Sir Hew Dalrymple nor Sir Harry Burrard was fit for the chief command in Portugal or Spain, at the critical period at which it was conferred on them. And hence arises the alleged necessity for inquiring to whose interposition were they indebted for their appointment? That they were both immediately appointed by the King, "there need no ghost come from the grave" to inform us; but the true question is, who recommended them to his Majesty? Sir Hew Dalrymple, having acted as military secretary to the commander in chief, on the continent, it is generally inferred, that he was indebted for his appointment to his Royal Highness; and as Sir Harry Burrard belongs to one of his Royal Highness's regiments, the first of Guards, he might naturally be supposed to have had the same patron. But whether the commander in chief did, or did not, recommend these generals, it is certain, we conceive, that the secretary of state for the war department, to whom the responsibility attaches, has a negative on all such appointments; and indeed it is known, that, in a case to which we formerly alluded, he exercised that negative, and, in our opinion, in a manner at once reprehensible, and injurious to the service. He, therefore must have approved the appointments, or he would not have sanctioned them; and for whatever portion of blame may be found to attach to them, he must, of course, be responsible to parliament and to the country.

It has been rumoured, that the late military appointments and transactions occasioned a great difference of opinion in the Cabinet, and that two of the secretaries of state, who strongly supported them, were warmly opposed by the third; and that the schism had proceeded so far as to threaten a change in the ministry. Various other rumours, on the same subject, and relating to some extensive alterations, have reached us; but as these reports too often originate in the wishes of those by whom they are circulated, we are loth to give them a hasty credence. There is little doubt, however, that a difference of

opinion among ministers has been manifested, respecting the operations in Portugal and Spain; and it must be confessed, that there has been a want of method and combination, for which it is difficult to account, and which, it is apprehended, it will be more difficult to justify, should a parliamentary inquiry be instituted into the conduct of the war minister, in the particular instance to which reference has been made, and no satisfactory reason assigned for it, we trust that his colleagues will have more regard for their country, than to risk the loss of their popularity and their power, by an attempt to defend him.

Divisions in the cabinet, at such a moment as the present, cannot be too strongly deprecated; but if they are occasioned by an attempt to resist improper and injurious appointments, from whatever quarter they proceed, those only can be blamed for them, whose conduct gives birth to the attempt. There is, certainly, something essentially wrong in our military proceedings; and when so much depends on the skill and judgment of our generals, no favour, no patronage should be allowed to supersede the superior claims of personal merit. To this consideration all others should be made to yield, and that cabinet minister will deserve and command the gratitude of his country, who takes his stand upon this principle, and perseveres in his resistance of every act which tends to its subversion.

We entertained hopes that some partial change would take place by the admission of Lords Wellesley and Melville to places of power and trust, in the ministry. They are both tried statesmen, of great experience and approved talents. The former is the first statesman now in Europe, and the only man in it whose comprehensive mind qualifies him to wield the mighty powers of this great empire, at a period when the fate of Europe hangs suspended by a fragile thread; and to oppose, with success, the gigantic efforts, and diabolical devices, of the Corsican tyrant of subjugated France. The present administration certainly contains many men of considerable talents, and of excellent principles, but it were vain to conceal, that there is no one in it of those transcendent abilities which extort respect and enforce obedience, it exhibits too great an equality of talent; or if there be one member of the cabinet whose endowments and attainments, at once brilliant and solid, temper the dazling lustre of genius with the sober tints of judgment, there are circumstances which prevent his superiority from producing those consequences which

ought naturally to result from it. It is, therefore, particularly desirable, that recourse should be immediately had to the only means of strengthening the ministry, which can be adopted without a sacrifice of principle.

It is with great satisfaction we have witnessed the increased exertions of the government, to afford assistance to the struggling patriots of Spain. Buonaparte has, indeed, succeeded, as we expected he would, in the first conflicts; and the sons of freedom have been defeated by the engines of tyranny; but, he has gained the victory contrary to our expectations, by a recourse to the same manœuvre which he so repeatedly employed against the Austrian armies in Italy; and which, at this late period, we should have thought, could not have been exercised with success, even against an army of recruits led by beardless ensigns. It has, however, prevailed against Castanos, whose defeat, as far as we can learn from the imperfect accounts which have reached this country, was occasioned by a too great extension of his line, which enabled the Corsican ruffian to direct his main force against the weakest point of the Spaniards. That the French have reached Madrid appears highly probable, after the dispersion of Blake's army, and the defeat of Castanos, though we attach not, and never shall attach, the slightest credit, to any account written or dictated by Buonaparte, who, in no single instance, throughout all his campaigns, was ever known to send a faithful account and true description of any action or military operation, in which he was engaged.

There is one thing in the conduct of the Spaniards which we candidly confess, has excited in our minds no small degree of astonishment and apprehension. When we recollect the zeal, activity, and enthusiasm which stamped the character of their first efforts in the noble cause of freedom, and which produced the destruction or capture of all the forces immediately opposed to them, we are utterly at a loss to account for their subsequent inactivity; and for their impolitic conduct in suffering an army of French, not superior in strength to that which they had lately subdued, to establish and maintain themselves on the frontiers of Spain, in the face of a greater force, until all the re-inforcements intended to join them from France had reached the place of their destination. To dislodge these troops, to defeat, and to disperse them, was an object of such immense consequence to all future operations, that every exertion should have been made to accomplish it; and, Buonaparte, too, from his

uncertainty respecting the intentions of Austria, had left them ample time for its accomplishment. We place every reliance on the courage and resolution of the Spaniards; but wherever Buonaparte is concerned, we confess, we cannot refrain from harbouring some lurking fears of *treachery*. Spain has produced one *Godoy*; it is possible, therefore, she may produce another. May our apprehensions be speedily relieved! Without treachery, we are persuaded, Spain cannot fall; but treachery will defeat all the plans of wisdom, and render abortive all the efforts of courage.

Our fears for the safety of Spain are by no means increased by the entrance of the French into Madrid. Indeed, could we flatter ourselves that Buonaparte would not leave his army, we should rejoice in the event; for certainly nothing will be more difficult than to preserve his communication with France, and few things more easy than to cut off his retreat, if the Spaniards remain firm, united, and resolved. In truth, on their firmness, union, and perseverance, does their fate depend!

There is certainly nothing in their actual situation, as far as it is known to us, to justify any relaxation of our efforts to assist them; in proportion, then, to our disappointment, and even disgust, at the reported determination of ministers to recall our forces, is our pleasure at witnessing their resolution to make exertions, in some degree correspondent with the emergency. Our opinion, indeed, remains immoveably fixed on the policy, propriety, and expediency, of calling forth all the resources of the state upon this occasion. Let our army in Spain be increased to one hundred thousand effective men; let thirty thousand more be landed in Calabria, and the honest natives of that country be supplied with arms and ammunition; and let the whole coast of France be kept in a state of alarm, by a third force of twenty thousand men, constantly afloat, and ready to disembark wherever a favourable occasion for effective service may occur. It is only by straining every nerve, by carrying on hostilities upon a large and wide extended scale, that we can expect either a speedy or a successful termination of the present contest. In Ireland, one hundred thousand volunteers might with facility, be raised, for limited service in Spain; and if the resolution were once adopted, and the proper tone given by government, their efforts, in such a cause, would be cordially seconded by the nation, and a force adequate to every purpose be raised without difficulty, and without delay.

Where can we fight the battles of Britain against France, with so much advantage, as on Spanish ground; where the efforts of the people, and the wishes of Europe, would be in our favour? It is an opportunity most unexpected, with which Providence seems to have supplied us; and if we neglect any means within our power for improving it, we shall be doubly criminal. It is a grand struggle between tyranny and freedom; it is, in all probability, the last conflict which we shall witness on the continent of Europe. Every motive, every reason, every inducement, then, combine to invigorate our efforts, and to impel us to show ourselves worthy the high rank and station which we hold among the few remaining independent nations of Europe. *Once more—let us not be wanting to ourselves.*

The firm conduct of our government respecting the insidious proposals of the Corsican, and his contemptible tool, the Russian Autocrat, as displayed in the masterly declaration of his Majesty, which does honour to the head that composed it, cannot fail to inspire the Spanish patriots with additional confidence in their allies, while the conduct of France and Russia must fill them with indignation and rage. The usurper, Buonaparte, he who, again and again, consecrated the *sovereignty of the people*, and swore to make their will the guide and rule of his political conduct, dares to stigmatize a whole nation, fighting for their religion, their liberty, and their laws, as insurgents, because they disdain to submit to another foreign usurper, not quite so criminal indeed as himself, but, if possible, more contemptible. *He*, who has so lately denounced the *impiety* of resistance to kings, presumes to revile the Spaniards as traitors, because they fight for their lawful sovereign, to whom they have sworn allegiance! If the wretched people of the continent, and their more wretched sovereigns, will tamely bear this, will look passively on, while the murderer of Jaffa thus tramples on the necks of a whole nation, treating them as a herd of cattle, to be transferred, at his pleasure, from one to another, not only without their consent, but contrary to their declared will;—if they will tolerate such injuries and such insults, they are lost to hope, and are sunk to a state of such abject degradation, as to be too low for pity, and too contemptible for resentment. Let Austria and Russia, too, look to themselves; their fate approaches; and without speedy exertion on the part of the former, and a speedy restoration to common sense, and

common honesty, on the part of the latter, they will, ere long, be involved in one common ruin.

We have no room left either for extending our reflections on the present state of Europe, or for making animadversions on the message of *Citizen* Jefferson to his American Congress; with all his Jesuitical art, the president has not been able to conceal the cloven foot. In confounding the conduct of Great Britain with that of France, which gave rise to it, in accusing us of a disregard of the *rights* of neutral powers, in charging us with acts of spoliation and injustice, and in asserting that we offered no adequate satisfaction for the affairs of the Chesapeake, he has betrayed a most profligate contempt of truth; and the most despicable hypocrisy. Infected with French principles, and strongly attached to the Corsican usurper, (who has lately done justice to the sentiments and views of his trans-atlantic friend,) his constant object, though he has not dared to avow it, and the tendency of all his measures, have been, to involve the United States in a war with this country. Sorry are we to announce the complete success of his party in the late elections, and their hopes of producing a war with Great Britain are, in consequence of this event, so sanguine, that *privateers are actually fitting out at New York and other parts of America*, with a view to hostilities. We trust, however, that the federalists will still act with sufficient spirit and firmness, greatly to abridge, at least, the reign of jacobinism, which threatens, under the auspices of Citizen Jefferson, to be as fatal to American, as it has proved to European liberty!

P. S.—We understand, that although Sir Harry Burrard was indebted for his appointment to the Duke of York, his Royal Highness had nothing to do with the appointment of Sir Hew Dalrymple. Justice to Sir Harry, too, requires us to add, that when he accepted his appointment, it was only as *second in command* to Sir Hew Dalrymple, whom he expected to find in Portugal on his arrival in that country. Consequently the circumstance of his being called upon to act as commander in chief in Portugal was totally unlooked for by him, and he was thus thrown into a situation for which he was totally unprepared. Great allowances, therefore, are certainly to be made for him.

Dec. 27, 1808.

MISCELLANIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW.

Sir,

THE Stipendiary Curate's Bill, which, in the last Session, after being passed in the House of Commons by a very large majority, was thrown out by the House of Lords, chiefly because the Session was too far advanced to allow time for its discussion in a manner suitable to its importance, will probably, after such a result, again engage the attention of Parliament. To the object of this Bill, the bettering of the condition of the inferior Clergy, every friend to the Church must wish success; but a considerable difference of opinion has arisen, even among persons of this description, respecting the means by which it was attempted to attain that object. As the proposer of any measure is entitled, in the first instance, to be heard in its behalf, the letter which Mr. Perceval addressed to the Rev. Dr. Mansel, in explanation of his views in bringing forward such a Bill, and in answer to the objections which he understood to have been urged against it, has a just claim to the attention of the public. As, however, this letter, though printed, has only been circulated in particular channels, the public are not in general acquainted with it. I therefore take the liberty, Sir, of troubling you with a Copy for insertion, if you think proper, in your valuable Miscellany; being confident, that it will be new to a majority of your readers. And I doubt not, that your impartial pages will be open to such observations as any of your correspondents may be disposed to offer, either in refutation or in confirmation of the reasoning contained in it. One remark only I will, by your permission, make.—Whatever opinion may prevail respecting the expediency of the Bill in question, no man is more entitled than its author to be considered as a sound and consistent member, and a firm and zealous friend, of our excellent Church establishment.

AMICUS ECCLESIÆ.

Copy of a Letter to the Rev. Dr. Mansel, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, on the Subject of the Curate's Bill.

"My dear Sir,

"I enclose for your perusal, a copy of the Bill which I have recently introduced into the House of Commons, for improving the condition of the Stipendiary Curates. I know that upon former occasions you have felt considerable doubt, to say the least of it, upon the policy and justice of the measure which this Bill is to enforce; and, as I cannot but ascribe a great part of the opposition which it has heretofore met with, and may again experience, to a misconception of its objects and principle, and as I am anxious that it should not have to encounter the weight of your opposition, unless it really deserves it, I have determined to trouble you with a summary statement of all the various arguments, as well as I can

collect them, which have been urged either in opposition to it or in its support.

"The object of the measure (to state it shortly) is this: to obtain larger salaries for Stipendiary Curates resident on Benefices where the Incumbents do not reside themselves, and where the incomes of the Benefices furnish funds adequate to afford such salaries.

"If there were no other recommendation of this measure, than that it promised relief and assistance to a very meritorious and industrious class of the community, it would deserve, as I conceive, a favourable consideration; but its effect, with a view to the public interest, is its great recommendation. For no man who feels the important advantages of Religion, as it regards merely the temporal happiness of individuals and the security and interests of the state, can hesitate to acknowledge the great benefits to be derived to the community from any measure which shall improve the condition of the poorer orders of the resident Parochial Ministers, whether Rectors or Curates. I hardly know any thing which would confer a greater blessing on society, than to secure generally, in every parish throughout the country, a resident officiating Minister of the Established Church, with such provision for their maintenance as might rescue them from that contempt to which, under a state of indigence, they are almost inevitably exposed. Indeed, I must do the opposers of this measure the justice to say, that they have uniformly admitted the value and the importance of the measure, as thus explained, professes to pursue. Their objections are all directed against the method which the Bill adopts for accomplishing its purpose.

"The method it adopts is, by giving power to the Bishop to assign to such Resident Curates, where the Incumbents do not reside, one-fifth of the value of the Benefice. The operation however of this Bill is confined to those Benefices only where the annual value exceeds four hundred pounds, with a provision, that in no case the Curate's salary should exceed two hundred and fifty pounds per annum. The Bill is so confined, because the 36 Geo. III. cap. 83. as you know, does already enable Bishops to assign salaries to the amount of seventy-five pounds per annum, with the use of the Parsonage-house, or an allowance instead of it; and therefore, no alteration is called for in the law, upon the principle on which this Bill proceeds, so far as respects Livings of such inferior value.

"The objections which have been stated to this measure are, that it is an improper subject for Parliamentary interference; that it is a violation of ecclesiastical property, which should be held by the Legislature as sacred and inviolate as any other; that it is an innovation upon the Established Church, and an act of plunder upon its property; that the idea of increasing the salary of Curates upon a scale graduated by reference to their Rector's incomes, and not by reference to the quantum of the Curate's duty, as well as that of interfering to regulate and prescribe the terms of the

contract between the Rector and the Curate (two parties competent to take care of their own interests) is inconsistent as well with the principles of justice as of policy; and lastly, the whole has been represented as proceeding from some dark and mysterious design of hostility to the Established Church, which, disguised under the hypocritical appearance of meaning well to the Church and Religion, aims a deadly and fatal blow at the interests of both; and pursues its object by means of new, unprecedented and discretionary powers given to the Bishop, which, destroying the independence and dignity of the Ecclesiastical character, will drive from the profession every person of a liberal and independent mind.

"As to those objections which consist in the supposed impropriety of Parliamentary interference, in the alledged violation of Ecclesiastical property, the innovation upon the Established Church, and the plunder of its property, I cannot introduce my answer to them more properly than by first pointing out the circumstances which originally attracted my notice to the subject.

"You are well acquainted, no doubt, with the Act which was brought into Parliament by Sir William Scott, respecting the residence of the Clergy. It appeared to me, and to others who interested themselves in the discussion which it underwent in its progress through Parliament, that it should have been accompanied by such provisions as my Bill is intended to supply; and, indeed, it was contended, that such provisions should have been embodied in that Act. That Act was indisputably intended, by its most respectable author, to enforce the residence of the Clergy, and it certainly does contain some very beneficial provisions for that purpose, by giving to the Bishops a more summary and effectual power of enforcing such residence; but it cannot be denied, that it contains also not only a prodigious number of excuses for non-residence, which myself and others ineffectually endeavoured to diminish, but also what we with equal ill success endeavoured to oppose, a great extension of the time which was recognized before as the legal limit within which non-residence was exempted from penalty. It extends, for instance, the *one* month allowed under the statute of Henry VIII. to *three;* that is, it extends it at once from a twelfth of a year to a fourth; consequently, whatever powers of a summary nature it may give, (and it does give, as I have before stated, most useful powers of that description to Bishops, for compelling residence in those cases in which it still continues to authorize a legislative and penal compulsion to reside), it unquestionably frees the Clergy from the penalties which attached on non-residence in a great variety of cases, in which, but for that Act, they would have remained liable. It was contended at that time, and I contend still, that when Parliament relaxed to the beneficed Clergy their obligation to residence, it ought to have done so upon terms; it ought to have annexed to that extended liberty of non-residence the condition (and an indispensable condition too it should have made it) of furnishing their

respective parishes, during their absence, with a resident Curate; and of furnishing that Curate also with a maintenance, by which he might support the character, and represent the dignity, of the officiating Minister in his parish, in a manner which should bear some degree at least of proportion to that in which, if the Rector remained to do his own duties, he would have been enabled, from the income of his rectory, to have supported it himself; and of which, consequently, he deprives the parish of the benefit, by withdrawing himself from the discharge of his duties. Such a provision, I say, ought to have constituted a part of that Act. It was contended in the House of Commons, and in the House of Lords too, that there ought to have been such a provision. It was admitted by those who supported that Act, that such a provision was most reasonable; but it was contended, that such a provision, with all the modification and qualification with which it must have been accompanied, would have very much incumbered that Bill, and that therefore it had better be made the subject of another. The Act was therefore permitted to pass upon the express undertaking of those who favoured it, that a Bill, upon the principle on which mine proceeds, should immediately be brought in. In pursuance of such promise, such a Bill was brought in. Unfortunately, however, a money provision was annexed to it in favour of those Curates who, it was imagined, might be deprived of their curacies by the effect which Sir William Scott's Act would have upon compelling the residence of the Rectors: and the Lords rejected it, upon the objection that it was inconsistent with their privileges, to pass it under such circumstances. The Bill for the same purpose was again brought in and passed through the House of Commons in the next Session: it passed also through the House of Lords; but in its passage through that House, it was amended in some of its money clauses, and the House of Commons then, consistently with the uniform practice of that House, could not do otherwise than refuse their consent to a Bill, in the money provisions of which the Lords had made any amendment. When this Bill, so amended, came back from the Lords, the Session was too far advanced for a new Bill, and therefore the renewal of it was necessarily deferred to the following Session. In the following Session it was renewed, but then Mr. Pitt, who had uniformly given it his steady support, was no more; and, Mr. Fox flinging his weight against it, into the scale of the opponents, it was lost on the second reading. Why the change of Government should have made such a change in the opinions of the House of Commons on such a measure as this, it is by no means to my present purpose to enquire; but, as far as respects Mr. Fox's opposition, it is but due to him to state, that he expressed himself as friendly as possible to the general object of the measure; and if I have any ground of complaint against his opposition, it is, that wishing well to the object, he gave, as it appeared to me at least, too great weight to objections which were made to some of the detailed provisions, and which might certainly have been removed by amendments in the Committee.

This fate could not, as I think at least, have attended this measure, if the provision for it had been ingrafted into Sir William Scott's Act; for many who were eager and anxious for the act relaxing the obligations to residence in favour of the Rectors who did not perform their duties, exhibited, unfortunately, no similar eagerness and anxiety for a Bill, which was to provide for the better maintenance of the Curates who did perform those duties in their stead. But I cannot see how either Patron, or Rector, or any advocate for either of their interests, could have objected, had the provision for such better maintenance made part of that Act. The condition must have been felt to be reasonable; it would have been urged, and must have been felt, that the law would only apply to cases of non-residence; if the Rector did not take the advantage of non-residence he would not be within the reach of that law, and if he did take that advantage, he could not complain that he was obliged to submit to the condition upon which alone he was admitted to the advantage. The objection that the Legislature can have no justifiable ground for interfering and exercising its jurisdiction upon the subject, could not possibly have been urged or felt by them, at whose instance, and for whose benefit, the Legislature was called upon to interfere to exercise its jurisdiction, by relaxing the obligations to residence, by indemnifying against penalties which had been incurred, and modifying with new provisions those which were to attach thereafter. And, even in the state in which the matter now stands, the idea of denying the propriety of parliamentary interference to enforce the object of such a measure as is now under consideration, upon any other ground than such (if any such can be produced) as may shew its inexpediency and impolicy, is extravagant to a degree that is perfectly incomprehensible.

"It cannot be doubted that the Canon Law, the Common Law, and the Statute Law, require residence. In the third volume of Dr. Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, p. 281, under title '*Residence*,' you may find authorities for this position.

"'The *Bishop* shall provide that in *every* church there shall be '*one Resident*.'

"'The rule of the ancient Canon Law was, that if a Clergy-'man deserted his church or prebend, without just and necessary 'cause, and especially *without the consent of the Diocesan*, he 'should be deprived;' and agreeably hereunto was the practice in this realm: for, though sometimes the Bishop proceeded only to *sequestration*, or other censure of an inferior nature, yet the more frequent punishment was *deprivation*. Gibs, 827.

"'Regularly Residence is required of Ecclesiastical persons 'upon their Cures.' The intendment of the Common Law is, that a Clerk is resident on his Cure. 2 Inst. 625.

"In furtherance of these Canon Law and Common Law obligations to residence, the Legislature interfered about the time of the Reformation, to impose statutary obligations to reside, and pecuniary penalties for non-residence. Those obligations were by Sir William Scott's Act modified, at least, if not relaxed. And

all that my argument assumes is this, that the Legislature which does relax these Canon and Common Law obligations to residence, and does define its limits, must of necessity be competent to annex such conditions upon its modifications and relaxations, as it shall see fit; and may therefore unquestionably say to the Clerk, who by the Canon Law is obliged to reside, we mean to enforce the Canon Law obligations to residence by temporal penalties, but they shall not apply unless your non-residence is of a given extent, provided you secure the residence of a Curate in your absence, and furnish him with what we deem a competent maintenance. If you do not choose to comply with these terms, then we will compel you by temporal penalties to perform that duty which the Canon Law imposes upon you. With this view of the argument, surely it must be absurd to contend that it is incompetent for Parliament to interfere, and that such interference is either an innovation upon the Church, or a violation and plunder of its property.

"As to such interference being charged as an innovation on the Established Church, the Church of England, the Church which takes the date of its legal establishment certainly not before Henry the Eighth's time, see how that charge stands. It is clear from what has been already said, that the statutary penalties for non-residence are as old as the Reformation. The *English* Church has never had an existence but accompanied with the legislative provision of the statute of Henry the Eighth, till the passing of Sir William Scott's Act. Can any man possibly deny the right of the Legislature to repeal Sir William Scott's Act, which has passed within these four years, and which is only a temporary law that will expire of itself, unless it is continued; and consequently (for such would be the effect of its repeal) to revive the penalties of the former statute of Henry the Eighth? If then it is clearly competent to the Legislature to repeal the late Act, can there be any doubt that it can, instead of repealing it entirely, suffer it to remain, annexing to the advantages which it confers on the Beneficed Clergy those conditions on which alone they may still be allowed to enjoy them? The impropriety, therefore, of legislative interference, must unquestionably depend entirely upon the inexpediency and impolicy of such interference, and not upon any doubt of the competency of Parliament to interfere. And I do trust that these observations are abundantly sufficient to remove any degree of possible doubt which has been endeavoured to be raised, upon the full, absolute, entire and unquestionable competency of the Legislature to interfere with whatever regulations it may conceive expedient and necessary to enforce the performance of any duties which the Common Law, which the Canon Law, and which the reason and nature of the Establishment annex to the possession and enjoyment of Ecclesiastical property.

"The objection which is founded upon the supposed violation of Ecclesiastical private property, which ought to be held as sacred as any other, is in no small degree affected by the argument upon the former point. I agree, and would contend as strongly as any

man, that Ecclesiastical property should be held as sacred and inviolate as any species of property whatsoever; but, the question is not, whether that property ought not to be held as sacred, as much under the protecting guardianship of the Legislature as any other; but, whether there are not duties and conditions annexed to the enjoyment of that property, which do not attach to any other? and whether those duties ought not to be held sacred also, and ought not to be protected by legislative guardianship? That it is subject to many considerations which distinguish it materially from other property, it is impossible that any one should seriously deny. This property is rather to be considered as the reward and salary for the performance of Ecclesiastical duties. It was given probably in early times of Christianity by Kings or great proprietors, for the support of the Ministers of religion in the performance of their important duties. How it was originally derived to the Church is a matter of mere antiquarian curiosity and research. The Canon and Common Law which have been referred to, prove the condition on which it is *now* holden, whatever might have been the condition on which it was originally given. Nothing can be more clear, than that the non-performance of these duties is an actually legal cause of forfeiture. Can it then be seriously maintained, that if use, the fashion of the times, or any other cause shall have introduced too great a degree of remissness in the discharge of any of those duties, that the Legislature cannot interfere, either by punishment to correct this remissness, or by regulations to qualify and diminish its mischievous effects, without being charged with a violation of private property, and an abandonment of those cautious principles upon which it abstains in other cases from interfering with the rights and possessions of individuals?

"The argument cannot be pushed to that extent; at least, if it is, it cannot have any effect upon persons really acquainted with the subject. But then it is said by those, who cannot deny that church property is held upon the condition of performing the duties belonging to the station to which it is annexed, that all the duty which is annexed to this species of property is this: that the proprietor, the Incumbent, should either discharge the duties of it himself, or find some one who will discharge them for him;—that the terms on which he can prevail upon a man to discharge these duties are mere matters of private contract between the Rector and his Curate;—that the Curate is the true and only person to put the proper estimate on the value of his own labour; and if he is contented, no one else has a right to interfere or complain.

"Now I must deny absolutely the proposition, that no person has a right to interfere in regulating the salary of the Curate, except the Rector and the Curate themselves. But I am not disposed to deny, that all the condition which is annexed to this sort of property, and on which the Incumbent holds it, is either to discharge the duties of his office himself, or to find another person as his Curate to discharge them for him. But then those duties,

which are to be performed either by himself or his substitute, must be well understood; and it must also be taken into the account, that he is not himself the judge to determine whether they are sufficiently discharged. We have seen by reference to the Canon Law, that Residence is one of those duties; that the desertion of the Benefice is a legal cause of privation; and we need only look at the form of a faculty of dispensation for a plurality, to see with what guards, and upon what terms, where the law allows the appointment and substitution of a Curate, in the case of the Non-residence of the Incumbent, such appointment and substitution must be made.

"This form is printed in third volume of Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, p. 103. It contains the following provisoes:

"'Provided always, that in each of the churches aforesaid, as 'well in that from which it shall happen that you shall be for the 'greater part absent, as in the other on which you shall make 'perpetual and personal residence, you do preach thirteen ser-'mons every year, according to the ordinances of the Church of 'England promulged in that behalf; and do therein sincerely, 'religiously, and reverently handle the holy word of God; and 'that in the benefice from which you shall happen to be most ab-'sent, you do nevertheless exercise hospitality two months in the 'year; and for that time, according to the fruits and profits 'thereof, as much as in you lieth, you do support and relieve the 'inhabitants of that parish, especially the poor and needy. Pro-'vided also, that the cure of the souls of that church from which 'you shall be most absent, be in the meantime, in all respects, 'laudably served, by an able Minister, capable to explain and 'interpret the principles of the Christian Religion, and to declare 'the word of God unto the people, in case the revenues of the 'said church can conveniently maintain such Minister; *and that 'a competent and sufficient salary* be well and truly allowed and 'paid to the said Minister, *to be limited and allotted by the proper 'Ordinary at his discretion*, or by us or our successors, in case the 'Diocesan Bishop shall not take due care therein.'

[To be concluded in the Appendix.]

AUTHENTICITY of St. MATTHEW's GOSPEL,

Proved against the Socinians and Monthly Reviewers,

TO THE EDITORS OF THE ANTI-JACOBIN,

Gentlemen;

WHILE the principles upon which your Review is conducted engage the grateful regards of the friends of religion and the country, and you have inserted several communications in behalf of our ecclesiastical and civil establishment, the Jachin and Boaz of the Temple of God, I trust the following answer to a Socinian objection, against the authenticity of St. Matthew's gospel, will find admission into a corner of your Review, which I conceive to be the best method of making it known. To a monthly critic

I once offered the substance of my communication to you, the Socinian objection having been stated in that literary journal; but *the answer could find no admission, though the pernicious objection did:* I had made a positive requisition, upon the ground of fair criticism, that as their partial critique offered *the poison*, it should afterwards present *the antidote:* after three months pause, it was flatly rejected: *so much* for the monthly tissue of infidelity. But having not received any answer to the objection I submit it to you.

Socinian Evanson had observed that the authenticity of St. Matthew's gospel was invalidated by the account that evangelist gives of the region of Decapolis; because, as the allegation states, when St. Matthew's gospel was published, that district of Judea was not known, nor till afterwards, under the name of *Decapolis:* ergo, his history is a forgery!

Now, whatever a man's *religious* or *irreligious* creed may be, (for even Atheists have a *creed* though not a religious one), to bring, on such *pretended* ground, a charge of such a nature, against a writer of established credit for so many centuries, on the authenticity of whose relation the faith of the Christian world in a great measure depends, is an act, which, if unsupported by indubitable facts, deserves the name of an impious falsehood, and a wicked assertion that must consign to merited reprobation both the man and his principles.

When I first met with the assertion in the Monthly Critique, (some time before the Antijacobin raised his bulwark in defence of all that is dear and sacred in the world), the shock to my feelings was electrical: in an obscure retirement, with but very few books about me, I was still resolved to use such helps as I had to enquire into the truth of the assertion: but how great my indignation was when I detected *the falsehood* of the charge, every *honest* mind may readily conceive. Upon consulting Mintert's Lexicon, on the word DECAPOLIS, I found these words: "Nos hanc regionem totam collocamus trans Jordanem in finibus Cœle-Syria, cujus pars fuit, secundum Plinium Hist. Nat. Lib. v. Cap. 18—quem sequitur Cluverus. Finding Pliny in a friend's library, I referred to the passage which forms a part of his geographical account of Judea; in which he enumerates the cities of the DECAPOLIS—The word being the Greek for "*the ten cities*," was probably of as old standing as the reign of the Syrian kings, of the line of the Seleucidæ, who oppressed Judea. But to ascertain with precision, the time when Pliny thus describes the chorography of that region, was in some measure necessary, because, as he was twenty years in composing his Natural History, and as he died A. D. 79 of suffocation while viewing the eruption of Mount Vesuvius, there might be an interval of time betwixt the latest assigned date of St. Matthew's gospel (A. D. 64) and the death of Pliny in A. D. 79, sufficient for a change in the topical description of a country: though that was not probable, as the Roman Census did not easily admit such local changes:—However Pliny himself sufficiently clears up the point: for in his *twentieth* book (as I remem-

ber, for I lost my memorandum in a change of place) he mentions that Claudius Cæsar was at that time emperor. Now Claudius began his reign A. D. 41, and died (by poison) A. D. 54: consequently the description of the DECAPOLIS by name, in Pliny's *fifth* book, must have been *prior* to the death of Claudius A. D. 54, antecedently to which period Pliny wrote his *twentieth* book. There are several periods assigned for the publication of St. Matthew's gospel; of which the *least* probable is that of A. D. 41 as assigned by Eusebius in the 4th century—for Eusebius was further removed from the apostolic age than other writers who bring down the publication to A. D. 61 or 64: but the earliest date will be coincident with the first year of Claudius Cæsar, during whose reign Pliny writes his topographical account of the Decapolis, not as from himself, but on the authority of *prior* chorographical writers, to whose works he refers as his authorities: consequently even upon this ground Mr. Evanson's assertion does not hold good: for it can be of no force, *unless* it can be proved from historical records, that Decapolis received its name *after* the *presumed* date of St. Matthew's gospel by Eusebius, i. e. the first year of Claudius, and *before* his death; for we have seen that Pliny, from prior writers, describes the region of Decapolis by that name, *during* the reign of Claudius: but *such* proof is neither produced, nor is to be produced, for it exists not—Besides; as St. Matthew's gospel was written *in* or *near* Judea, for the benefit of the Hebrews, who then existed as a national body in that country, *prior* to the destruction of their polity, St. Matthew could never have passed a forged description of their own country upon their faith while their own eyes and ears testified the contrary. But this argument is, ex abundanti, more than is requisite to proof, and is only urged to shew the *falsehood* and *absurdity* of the allegation of a presumed forgery.

But the date of St. Matthew's gospel, even as admitted by Evanson, being later than the time of Pliny's writing his Natural History, and the description of the Decapolis, upon his own admission, oversets his whole allegation: for if that description was compiled from older writers by Pliny, in the reign of Claudius, which ended in A. D. 54, and the gospel of St. Matthew was not published, as Evanson admits till A. D. 61 or *later* (I forget which date he assigns to it) consequently the *very ground* of his charge of falsification is destroyed. Lardner places the publication of that gospel in A. D. 64, in or near Judea: Mill assigns an earlier date, i. e. 61, upon numerous authorities, as may be seen in his Prolegomena, section 62. Thus this mighty objection to the authenticity of St. Matthew's gospel turns out a *mere falsification*, having no foundation but *ignorance* or *heretical pravity*. *Why* Socinians should endeavour to subvert the credibility of St. Matthew's gospel we need not wonder. The baptism of Jesus in Jordan was an event, as the ancients observed, that manifested the agency of the blessed Trinity in the redemption of man. And as an early father, Clemens Alexandrinus observes, that the gospels containing the genealogies were written first, so

was there an evident reason for it; that the Jews, before the rejection of their nation, might have evidence from those genealogies (then in their own possession) that Jesus was the descendant of Abraham by the Patriarchs, and heir of David; *consequently* their King Messiah, the Redeemer of Israel, and the Saviour of the world; for without that descent his claim to those characters could not have been substantiated.

While I am on this subject, permit me to extend my remarks to two other passages of the New Testament records, confirmed by heathen writers. St. Luke in the Acts, viii. 27, relates the conversion and baptism of "an Eunuch of great authority under Candace queen of Ethiopia;" this appears to be an event of the year A. D. 34. This queen, according to Strabo and Pliny, reigned in the time of Tiberius: (the date agreeing with the Scripture records); she was one-eyed and famed for her fortitude, say those writers: and the seat of her kingdom was at Meroe: Pliny, lib. vi. c. 29. Now Pliny (the elder) dying in A. D. 79, at the age of 56, was contemporary with Candace; and the desert near Gaza, where Philip baptized the Treasurer, was *in the way* to Meroe. But a more remarkable testimony to the facts recorded in the Acts is in chap. xi. 27. "In those days (viz. A. D. 43) came prophets from Jerusalem to Antioch, and one of them, Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be a great dearth throughout the world; which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar." According to Tacitus, a Roman knight had a dream to the same purpose; for relating which dream he suffered under Claudius Cæsar A. D. 47. But the famine actually occurred, (A. D. 51) and the Roman people violently assaulted the emperor Claudius in the Forum on the occasion of that calamity; Tac. Annal. lib. xii. sect. 43. Comp. Sueton. in Claud. chap. 18. and Josephus Antiq. lib. xx. c. 2. which prove not only the *fact* on record in the Acts, but the coincidence of time from the testimony of enemies.

It is of high importance in these days of infidels' scorn, and of Socinian (or Deistical rather) hostility to the pure faith of the gospel, to confirm the Scripture records by such facts as are recorded by the elder brethren of those gentlemen, the heathen historians, to whom with Hume and Gibbon they bow down with lowly reverence; "that the mouth of all wickedness may be stopped." And if the consequences of infidelity in France cannot bring them to their senses, they must be left to convictions that will hereafter come home to their bosoms, when they will be apt to say with their friends of the Julian School; "THIS GOD OF THE CHRISTIANS IS A VERY TERRIBLE ONE."

N.

FABRICATED TRAVELS IN SPAIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ANTIJACOBIN REVIEW.

THE EDITOR of the TRAVELS THROUGH SPAIN, noticed in the last Number [for Sept.] of the Antijacobin Review, begs leave to trouble the Editor of that Review with a few observations.

The Antijacobin reviewer seems to aspire to the character of a poor simple soul, indignantly abhorrent from every species of literary fiction, and quite ignorant that such things *have been* given to the public, and have even been *borne with* *. It will hardly be denied that the public were eager for some information relative to Spain; the rapid † sale of the book proves it: what has been done therefore was, *on the basis* of a recent *original tour*, which had never been published but (in detached parts) ‡ in a periodical work, to engraft such further accounts as might make an acceptable and interesting book. THAT A GREAT § PROPORTION OF THE SUBSTANCE OF ITS CONTENTS MIGHT BE TRACED TO FORMER PUBLICATIONS, IN DIFFERENT LANGUAGES, IS TRUE; but there is probably ‖ *more than one* falsehood in the assertion, that "there is *scarcely a page* which *we* (the Antijacobin reviewer) could not trace to one writer or another." The reviewer has stumbled upon the acknowledgment in the Preface, of obligation to the Voyage Pittoresque; and this he might have accompanied with a demonstration of the great wrong done to the British public, by putting them in possession, for a few shillings, of information, before accessible only through the medium of a foreign language, and at the price of as many guineas ¶:—but will the Anti-

---

* "Such things have been!" This is genuine Newgate logic: "there have been many greater robbers than me; why punish me more than others?" Such arguments are often urged at the Old Bailey. Is it possible that the *ci-devant* (we would say *late*, did we not know his *French* bias) sheriff, who does not deny being the *projector* of these travels, can have learned this species of logic in the discharge of his official duties?

† This is false, and S. must know it to be false; since the deception was exposed in the Antijacobin Review, the book has been rejected with scorn every where, and we know "more than one" bookseller, who would not keep such a work in their shops.

‡ Let the reader turn to the third volume of the "Modern Voyages and Travels." published by the same bookseller, and to the Monthly Magazine, for the account of Godoy, and then judge of the truth or falsehood of this assertion.

§ The word "great" was originally written in this letter, and afterwards artfully blotted. The truth came first; it is well; the writer has not yet attained the last stage of mental depravity.

‖ The insertion of the word "probably" evinces much more discretion than the profligate attempt to justify an avowed imposition. After reading the confession in the first part of this sentence, it would be an insult to the reader to attempt any additional confirmation of our former assertion of a now reluctantly acknowledged truth. The insinuation, however, that it is extracted from "different languages," is another instance of an attempt to deceive by artful pretensions, which are not founded in fact.

¶ This is the most barefaced falsehood we have ever witnessed, and we read it twice over before we could be certain that we had

jacobin kindly specify also the source of the "*commercial* and *statistical details*," which, whatever it may suit the Antijacobin to affirm, do exist in considerable quantity in these two volumes, and most certainly, in spite of Italics and uncials, *were* "collected with industry?"

To the charge of ignorance* of the Spanish language, the writer of this communication will merely oppose the *Italic* insinuation of the Antijacobin Review *against* the translation of the title "Prince of *the* Peace."

The Antijacobin reviewer doubtless congratulated himself on

---

not misunderstood it. The prospectus to Laborde's Picturesque Travels in Spain has been published twice in Millin's *Magasin Encyclopedique*, has been stitched in several French publications, and distributed *gratis* by the principal French booksellers in London, and one of them (we believe) has had it translated into English. Yet this is what S. does not hesitate to say he has given "for a few (10½) shillings," what would have cost "as many (10½) guineas!!!" The man who could deliberately make such an assertion, must be, either from habit or infirmity, incapable of discriminating between plain truth and the grossest falsehood. We will tell him, however, what we are certain he did not before know, that this prospectus, which he so much admires, was not written by Laborde, or any other Frenchman, but by the late respectable director of the Cabinet of Natural History at Madrid, in Spanish, from which it was translated into French. A copy of the original received from the author is now before us. As to the alledged "commercial and statistical details," they are in every respect beneath criticism, and just what might be expected from a man who was determined to make a volume without having any knowledge of his subject. In pretending to give tables of the agricultural products of Toledo, he has confounded the products of Valencia, Murcia, and Andalusia, with them. The whole statements too are above 20 years old, many of them more, although the work pretends to be *recent!* They have however already passed into oblivion, and we shall not now attempt to rescue them for a moment by any exposure of their absurdities. But what shall we say of a man, who pretends to state the mineral products of a country, and translates (p. 192, vol. ii) *alcohol*, into "compact galena," instead of *antimony?*" If others have made this mistake, it is no apology for the ignorance of a writer who pretends, but without any foundation in truth, to know the Spanish language.

* The flagrant instance of ignorance just quoted, is fully sufficient to substantiate the truth of our former remarks; we therefore, in charity to the writers of the Monthly Magazine, assign the subject to their learned discussion for six mohths, whether Godoy should be called prince "of *a* peace or *the* peace," as such an inquiry is admirably adapted to their genius. Let us, however, be just; there were formerly writers in that declining work who were capable of better things, but they have long since abandoned it in disgust.

having found a *mare's nest**, when he blundered† upon the extract from Semple, about the Prado. That this was not marked as a quotation, is not the fault of the editor; who positively declares‡, that in his manuscript he wrote the first three words of the extract with the usual marks for that purpose, adding the words "says a recent lively traveller," and then referring the compositor to the book itself. The work however was printed in too much haste to admit of the editor's seeing the proofs. The Anti-jacobin reviewer accordingly, exulting in his discovery, has poured out the whole vial of his wrath on the occasion:—"*appropriating our neighbour's property—pretended travels—stolen goods—open court—robbery—judge and jury—Buonaparte—highwayman—barefaced audacity—literary profligacy—barefaced plagiary—audacious imposition—four whole pages—abandoned impudence—plunderer—robbed—trespass on the public—feloniously purloined—delusive volumes—old-fashioned honesty—pretended travels* (again)—*summed up evidence—heard verdict—impartial jury—deliberately pronounce—guilty—sheriff to execute sentence—infamous delinquent—admonish the culprit—atone to society—manifold sins—implore mercy of God—blasphemed—deceptions—calumnies—scandalous imposition*§" —seem all together too lenient. It certainly was most horrid, flagitious, dreadful, shocking, tremendous, infernal, and (to include all in one word) jacobinical, to *delude* the *unwary* public, by giving them as original, an extract which *had appeared* VERBATIM *in all*‖ *the newspapers a month before!* ¶

---

* This is a very elegant phrase, and must be useful in the Bridge-street factory.

† Doubtless it was a very unfortunate blunder for the honest publisher of the Travels, who felt himself obliged to advertise in all the daily papers, the assigned name of their author; but not till after we had exposed the deception.

‡ This is a very singular declaration; who is responsible for this omission? The "editor" thus *denies* it, the "compositor" is not charged with it; then it must be the mighty publisher himself! We understand indeed that he has made a very humble apology to the injured party, and that he denied all knowledge of the plagiarism; yet his editor here indirectly accuses him of the fact. Is it usual to refer the "compositor" to "the book itself" whence extracts are made? Did the editor send all the books from which he "blunderingly" copied extracts, to the "compositor?" Our readers however will recognize in this declaration, something of the usual practice of the Phillipian book-factory.

§ The writer has done well to collect into a connected view the faithful features of his own or perhaps his employer's character: his own conscience, no doubt, although seared, bore testimony to their truth and justice.

‖ This is another most impudent untruth: it did not appear in *all* the newspapers.

¶ Here the writer has blotted over 13 lines in his letter, which he was perhaps somewhat ashamed of; and if we may judge of

After all, though he did not wish his name to be given to the public, the Travels in question are the production of as accomplished a gentleman as ever went the tour of Europe—I mean the *late* Mr. Whittington*, of Thebbarton-Hall, Suffolk, and late of St. John's College, Cambridge. This gentleman had projected a work of considerable consequence relative to Spain and Italy; but was prevented from executing it by his recent premature and lamented death. His capabilities are evinced by the little work which has been the object of your extraordinary criticism, and are well known to Lord Holland and other gentlemen who were in Spain during the late peace.

S.

THE PATRIOT'S DYING HOUR.

1.

WHEN plundering armies take the field,
And treason's *blood-stain'd* trophies fly,
The Patriot's soul, unborn to yield,
Glories in freedom's cause to die;
With bold indifference taught to scan
Death and the slaves who dread its power,
By wrongs provoked he feels the man,
This cheers the Patriot's dying hour.

2.

Like lightning's flash his ardent eyes,
The foes of freedom to engage,
Fierce to the sanguine combat flies,
Foremost he dares the battle's rage;

---

them from the few words that are still legible, they contain a singular example of stupidity and falsehood. He had designed to accuse us of drawing "two profitable pages" from the exposure of *his* plagiarism!!!

* It is doubtless a very safe plan, to father this miserable compilation on a dead man! It is probable the whole story, which has been advertised in the newspapers, has just as much foundation as that of "Whittington and his Cat." It is admitted, that the "greater part" of these travels "might be traced to former publications," then how audacious is the falsity of their pretence to be written "upon or near the spot?" But, we have already sufficiently exposed this contemptible imposition on the public. The knight may complain, that we should "review him as well as his books;" but when he acts as *editor* of his own works, when he publishes books with *fictitious* names in the title-pages, and when he is confessedly the chief projector and director of his own book manufactory, he must expect exposition while there is "one *honest* review," to develope such nefarious deceptions. As to the present writer, whether S[urr] or S[kinner], we say to him, ***vate impostor, callate tu necedad, dexa tus embustes, y sea mas justo por lo venidero.***

Zealous his country's cause to clasp,
Whom treachery's blood-hounds would devour,
Her rights to rescue from their grasp,
Cheers the brave Patriot's dying hour.

3.

Proud to revenge his country's woes,
Inspir'd by heaven and liberty,
He feels e'en as the *life-stream* flows,
It flows to make his *children free.*
Heaven aids the spirit that she gave
To vanquish base oppression's power;
Those rights secur'd he fought to save,
Cheer the brave Patriot's dying hour.

SAMUEL B. FROME,
Author of a Poem entitled "the Crisis, or Britain's Glory."
1*st Dec.* 1808.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE fourth Letter of "The Dissenter's True Friend," "The Isle of the Ocean," and several other favours, are necessarily postponed till our next.

☞ With the Number for January, 1809, will be published, the Appendix to Vol. XXXI, containing the usual Review of Foreign Literature, Memoirs of the late Mr. Whitaker, Retrospect of Politics, &c. &c.

ERRATA.

Our readers will please to correct the following errors in the Poem, entitled the "Contrast," which appeared from pages 100 to 109.

For—"*conspire*" to deck, read conspires. Page 100, line 5th from the bottom.

For—"*whose* tender wife," read *the* tender, &c. Page 102 from the top.

For—*un*perishable, read *in*perishable. Page 108, last line.

For—when *this* kind patron, read *their* kind, &c. Page 103, line 22.

For—*Murica*, read *Murcia*. P. 107, line 2.

For—*its* yours, read '*tis* yours to shew. Page 107, line 19.

For—saw *his* choice cohorts, read *her* cohorts. Page 107, line 11.

Transpose the lines Proud Rome, page 107, lines 3 and 4 from the bottom.

For—*and e'en* thy Hannibal, read *Carthage!* Thy Hannibal.

For escape *thy* fate, read *his* fate. Page 109, 3d line.

APPENDIX

TO

VOL. XXXI.

OF

THE ANTIJACOBIN REVIEW AND MAGAZINE.

Memoires de la Classe de Sciences Mathematiques et Physiques de l'Institut National de France.

Memoirs of the Class of mathematical and physical Sciences in the National Institute of France. First Part of 1807. pp. 379. 4to. Garnery, Paris.

WHATEVER reasons, or rather causes, there might be for prohibiting all commercial intercourse between two great and civilised nations, there certainly could be none for interdicting all literary communication. Such an act of antisocial barbarism, when considered in conjunction with numerous other acts of a similar tendency, must contribute very materially to prove, as has been suggested, the existence of a conspiracy against science, and a determination to arrest, if possible, the progress of human knowledge. True science, it is well known, is the greatest and most fatal enemy to despotism, as ignorance is its best support: the whole efforts therefore of Buonaparte have been uniformly directed, since his assumption of power, to overturn and disorganise all learned institutions, to degrade and render learned men contemptible in the estimation of the world, to withdraw all pecuniary support from public schools and academies, and finally to prevent the circulation of books and the diffusion of knowledge in society. The effects of such a systematic hostility to learning and the arts have been equally conspicuous and distressing in France

for several years. The public exhibitions of the products of industry in arts and manufactures, instituted by the republicans, have gradually declined, and at length sunk, never more to appear under the pressure of imperial power. To the tyrant, it was much more advantageous to have soldiers, than artisans, mechanics, or manufacturers: all these filled the ranks of the army; but the almost total stop to literary publications has widely extended the dominion of misery, without adding any thing to the numerical strength of the imperial forces. Authors in general are too old or too enervated to become soldiers; and the debarring them of a market for their works can only accelerate their passage to a premature death. The prohibition of intercourse with this country, where above half of all the works printed in France were sold, has consequently occasioned a considerable number of periodical and other publications in Paris to stop; while their authors, printers*, and publishers, are reduced to the dire alternative, of either dying with hunger, or terminating their miserable existence by self-murder†! Were such measures attempted in this country, they would produce louder remonstrances and a more determined opposition; but in France they are followed only by the silence of death. Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that literature and science should rapidly decline in France, and that a worse than Gothic barbarism should arise on their ruins. Even the present volume is an example of their national decadence in philosophy; for although it purports to be the work of the first six months (*premier semestre*) of the year 1807, yet the different dates of the papers include a whole year, and the volume was not published till the latter end of 1808. It was well observed by the president of the Royal Society, in his discourse at the last anniversary of that body, that while other nations are involved in war, and devoted to nothing but the slaughter of their species, we enjoy the most perfect tranquillity, are daily making discoveries in the arts and sciences, which shed a lustre on our country, and will astonish future ages. The farther this parallel is

---

* Since the revolution-wars diminished the population so extremely, the greater part of the printing executed in France has been done by decrepit or infirm men, and by women. — *Rev.*

† The same conveyance which brought us these volumes, also brought accounts of several persons of the above description terminating their career in this shocking manner. — *Rev.*

carried the more honourable will it be to the genius of Englishmen—but let the facts appear. The volume before us contains twenty-two articles, denominated as follow:

"An account of the plants published in the last five parts* of Ventenat's Selection of Plants."—"History of several vaccinations practised at Lucca in the months of June and July 1806, by M. Hallé."—"Chemical experiments to illustrate the history of the milt (laite) of fishes. By MM. Fourcroy and Vauquelin."—"Report on M. de Candolle's memoir, entitled, a View of the Nutrition of Vegetables, by MM. Chaptal, Labillardiere, and Cuvier."—"Memoir on ferruginous *(perrifère)* carbonat of manganese, by Lelievre."—"On the yenite, a new mineral substance, by the same."—"Observations on the extravasation of blood into the cavity of the pericardium, and on a collection of pus in this cavity, which was discharged internally by an abscess above the clavicle, by M. Sabatier."—"Memoir on fungous excrescences in the intestinal canal and other interior parts, by M. Portal."—"Account of a manuscript work, entitled a 'Theory of the actual Surface of the Earth,' by M. André, formerly known under the name of P. Chrysologue de Gy, by M. M. Hauy, Lelievre, and Cuvier."—"Account of a new machine, invented by MM. Nieppe, and called a *pyreolophore*, by MM. Berthollet and Carnot."—"Discovery of a new principle in the juice of asparagus, by MM. Vauquelin and Robiquet."—"Comparative experiments on the titan of France and the oisanite or anatase, by Vauquelin."—Result of observations, and construction of tables, to determine the degree of probability of curing deranged persons, by M. Pinel."—"Plan of, and observations on, the grand and beautiful nebula in the girdle of Andromeda, the first of which was discovered, with two small nebulæ one above and the other below the great one, seen in a telescope which reverses them as in the plate, by C. Messier."—"Memoir on the analysis of hair, by Vauquelin."—"Observations on the dispersion of the light of lamps, by means of shades, unpolished glass, silk-stuffs, &c. with a description of a new lamp, by Count Rumford, V. P. R. S. *associé étranger de l'Institut.*"—"Observations on the cooling of liquids in gilt and ungilt china vessels, by the same."—

* This is one of the many works of science which has been stopped in consequence of being deprived of the sale in this country.—*Rev.*

"Extract of a memoir on the analysis of some terreous iron mines in Burgundy and Frenche Comte; to which is added an examination of the cast iron and scoriæ of those mines, by M. Vauquelin."—"Account of the existence of platina in the silver mines of Guadalcanal in Estremadura, by the same."—"Report on the woollen cloth made at the manufactory of Montolieu, in the environs of Carcassonne, by M M. Fourcroy and Desmaret."—"Report on a new stocking-frame presented by M. Dautry, constructor of such machines, by M M. Coulomb and Desmaret."—"Memoir on the different kinds of oak which grow in France, and on those foreign to the empire which are cultivated in gardens and green-houses in the environs of Paris, by M. Bosc."

The above is a translation of the titles of all the papers which appear in this first part of the French Philosophical Transactions for 1807; and if they are compared with the same part of the English during that period, their frivolity and insignificance must be not a little pleasing to every genuine friend of his country. It should also be remembered, that the National Institution of France is a pensioned body, and that every one of its members are pensioners on the state, while the Royal Society of London has always been supported by the annual contribution of its members. No good government, indeed, will neglect to reward men of distinguished talents and integrity; but certainly no wise one will pension philosophical societies as corporate bodies. Yet it may be questioned if science would find any votaries in France, if she had nothing more substantial than knowledge and fame to bestow. But we must examine the contents of these papers more minutely, lest our readers should suppose that they contain something interesting or new.

Ventenat's account of his selection of plants does not pretend to any novelty. He has indeed introduced two new genera, and called them after two of his friends; but he seems to doubt that they may not have been described under other names by some foreign botanist. The first which he describes at length, is the new genus RIEDLEA in the order *Monadelphia Pentandria*, from J. Riedlé, a botanist who sailed with Capt. Baudin: the next is the TURPINIA in the *Polygamia Diœcia*, from M. Turpin. We have also some judicious observations on the POIRETA *scandens* in *Diadelphia Decandria*; the INGA *filipes* belonging to the genus ACACIA of Tournefort; and on the genera *Melastoma*

and *Rhexia.* Linnæus was acquainted with only twelve species of *melastoma.* Willdenow however has described eighty-nine, and Dr. Turton in his translation of the system of nature (noticed in this volume) has presented the English reader with descriptions of eighty-five species. Ventenat has also made some observations on the genera and species MAIETA annulata, M. *scalpata,* M. argentea; MERIANA ciliaris; TRISTEMMA *virusana.* The new genus POITEA, in the order Diadelphia Decandria, is dedicated to M. Poiteau, and belongs to the leguminous family, in which are also described the genera ERYTHRINA and RUDOLPHIA. The SCUTILLARIA SPATHODEA and GUAREA are the genera mentioned in this memoir, of which only a few species are described.

M. Hallé's account of some singular cases of vaccination is more interesting. Among eight children vaccinated at Lucca, in 1806, three had a regular vaccine-pock, and five an irregular one. The irregularities were, first, a local irritation arose before the vaccine pustule, which nevertheless did not obstruct the regular progress of the disease; second, the form of the pustule, which was depressed or hollow in the middle, and was surrounded by other smaller pustules; third, the nature of the scab, which was neither brown nor shining, but which finally terminated like regular pustules; fourth, the deviations of the areole from its circular form; and fifth, the eruptions complicated with the vaccine pustule: these eruptions were not capable of propagating any disease, and the fluid which they contained never became purulent. From the whole, M. Hallé concludes, that vaccination, however regular in its progress, may experience irregularities in the form of the pustule, and the external character of the scab: that whether regular or irregular, about the eighth or ninth day, when the areole is formed, may be accompanied with general eruptions, to which it appears to have given existence, but which consist of pustules of a particular nature. The form of these pustules is similar to that of the small-pox; but they differ in never having any thing but a serous fluid, never a true pus, and never have any regular periods. These irregularities and eruptions manifest themselves with an epidemic character; that is, on a certain number of individuals, and in a certain place or season.

"The same vaccine matter, taken at the same epochs from the handsomest and most regular pustules, can produce, in the same apparent circumstances, cow-pox, distinguished by the irregularities and eruptions here described, and reciprocally the latter irre-

gular pock can communicate the most regular pustules, both in their figure and periods. In cases where vaccine matter concurs with variolous contagion actually contracted, the vaccine-pock can be inoculated and transmit a true cow-pock, without, at the same time, transmitting the small-pox. Lastly, these irregularities do not destroy the preventive effect of vaccination."

M. Hallé, after stating these conclusions, relates a case, at Florence, of a child being three times vaccinated without taking effect; yet at the end of twenty-eight days was seized with a fever and eruption on the legs, which displayed all the appearances of regular vaccine pustules, and which furnished matter that produced in others a fine and regular vaccine-pock. Hence it has been inferred, that besides the local eruption there may be also a general vaccine eruption, which has all the advantages of the common vaccine-pock. From other facts observed, it is likewise concluded by M. Hallé, that the general eruption, being confined to certain individuals and places, is purely epidemical, and that it is not necessarily connected with vaccination.

Fourcroy and Vauquelin's chemical experiments on the milt of fishes are but unfinished productions. The preliminary experiments were directed to discover if the milt contained any alkaline or acid properties, of which it was entirely devoid. The combustion and calcination of milt, in an open fire, produced a little carbon and yielded a little phosphate of lime and ammonia, and also a sensible quantity of phosphate of magnesia. The calcined carbon of milt by washing in acid yielded a small quantity of lime, and much magnesia. The distillation of milt and examination of its carbon, afforded first much colourless water, next a white or yellowish oil, then a blood-red fluid oil; after this followed a brown thick oil, at the same time salts were condensed in crystals like needles; and lastly a white or yellowish red crust was found in the upper part of the retort. In the first products, carbonat of ammonia, prussiat of ammonia in great quantities, and some traces also of muriat of ammonia, were found. The property of yielding phosphorus by simple distillation, proves that this combustible body is an essential ingredient in the composition of milt.

The authors next operated on the milt with cold water, boiling water, and with alcohol: with the first it became like an emulsion, with the second like a jelly or coagulated albumen, and with the last it yielded a matter like the essence of soap. This animal soap, the product of milt when dissolved in alcohol, melts in a pan like grease, and

exhales much smoke and bitter vapour: the charcoal which it leaves yields to water some signs of alkali, and is precipitated by lime-water, which announces the presence of phosphats. The authors draw the following conclusions as the result of their experiments:—

"The milt of carp is neither acid, alkaline, nor sensibly salt: it yields no ammonia by the alkalies; it loses three quarters of its weight by well-managed desiccation; it leaves, either by calcination in an open fire, or by distillation not pushed to carbonization, a dense charcoal which scratches glass, constituting 0.05 of the milt, corroding platina, inflammable and acidifiable by a strong fire in open vessels, and yielding phosphorus by a violent heat in close ones. It appears therefore that milt is composed of two substances, one analagous to gelatin and the other to albumen, containing some traces of phosphats of lime, magnesia, and potash; and particularly a little phosphorus, which forms an essential part of its composition, as well as the hydrogen, carbon, and azote, with which it is combined. The phosphorus is so united with the carbon, that it is a true phosphuret, containing more than a twentieth part of its weight of phosphorus."

MM. Fourcroy and Vauquelin, in the conclusion of this essay, which is certainly very imperfect, as embracing the milt of only one species of fish, conjectures that the phosphorescence of fishes and many marine animals, as well as some insects, has some relation to the phosphorus contained in such abundance in the animated being.

(*To be continued.*)

Trelis Notice des Travaux de l'Academie du Gard.

Transactions of the Academy of Nismes.

(Concluded from Vol. 30, p. 475.)

M. DURAND has presented to the academy a long memoir on the style of architecture introduced by *Philibert de l'Orme*, who lived in the 16th century, and has been called the father of French architecture. M. Orme's plan was to raise light roofs on buildings, and not to injure neither the walls nor their picturesque effect by massy or extensive timber-work. This system is founded on mathematical principles; and it is rather surprising that most of the French buildings should still be so disgustingly heavy and tasteless in this respect.

Among the printed works presented to the academy, may

be noticed the third edition of Dubois's Life of *Malesherbes*. The French have exhausted their panegyrical vocabulary in praise of this little volume, which certainly owes its reputation more to its subject than to its own intrinsic merit. There is, too, something in the life of Malesherbes peculiarly fortunate for his reputation; and had he lived to be more known, it is very probable he would now have been much less admired. This Academy has several times offered a premium for an adequate memoir or eulogy on the life of this statesman, but none has yet appeared on which it could confer the reward. Honourable mention, indeed, is made in these Transactions of one presented with the motto, "*Bonum virum facilè crederes, magnum libenter.*" TAC.—But still it is not crowned by the Academy, which seems to entertain romantic ideas of the man. This is an additional proof that Frenchmen cannot discriminate between fortunate incident, and the creations of genius. M. Raymond, of Chamberry, likewise presented the academy with his work entitled "*Metaphysique des Etudes,*" or what we should call an Essay on Metaphysical Studies, although the author has adopted a more affected title. He professes to be a disciple of Condillac and Dumarsais.

The prize question in agriculture was, "In what cases is the rendering of woodlands cultivable *(defrichemens)*, useful—in what is it injurious?" This question was satisfactorily answered to the Academy, which has accordingly assigned the medal to its author; but he, equally generous and modest, two qualities not too common in France, declined the acceptance of the reward, persevered in withholding his name, and consigned the medal to the disposal of some future meeting of the Academy. This anonymous writer indeed discovers very superior powers of reasoning and acute observation. He combats with great strength of argument the vulgar opinion, that the conversion of all waste or woodlands into pasture or arable land is advantageous in France, and contends that trees are necessary to shelter the soil from tempests, droughts, and torrents.

"The slow, regular, and insensible succession of the seasons (it is observed) would soon disappear, if deprived of those beneficent trees, kind of mediators between earth and heaven, which guard the soil from their inclemency. Violent tempests, impetuous torrents, deprive plants of their nourishing juices, carry them into the beds of rivers, which soon conducts them to a distance to be swallowed for ever in the vast gulphs of the ocean. To the devouring heat of summer rapidly succeed the most sharp and bitter frosts; and the sun drying to a great depth and depriving the soil of its

fertilising mud, renders it, notwithstanding art and labour, scarcely able to yield, to those who have empoverished it, a feeble portion of the products, which at first, without any foreign succour, it produced in profusion. In vain has the art of degrading, empoverishing, and exhausting the earth been perfected; all art has its limits, and the intemperance of the seasons, joined to the slow but irresistible action of the waters incessantly contending against it, render its efforts impotent. What other resource then remains to civilised man, except that of abandoning, as he has perhaps already done some countries in Asia and Africa, a soil which can no longer suffice his wants, and go to stub some unknown and uncultivated country, until that having reduced the whole globe to a state presenting only vast seas, arid rocks, and sterile plains, he experiences the just punishment of his want of foresight?"

In order however to answer the question proposed, it was necessary to define the term *defrichement*, which is usually considered as "giving value to uncultivated land;" but as all uncultivated land is not without value, the Academy limited this term to the "application of the process of art to land without culture." This necessarily embraces all kinds of uncultivated soil, whether marsh, moor, or woodland. The author accordingly has divided his Essay into parts, which treat of the draining of marshes, the stubbing of woodlands, and the cultivation of downs, heaths, and moorlands. The first part is devoted to examine the pecuniary advantages to the agriculturist, as well as the general melioration of the climate resulting from the draining of marshes. Here the author cites the laudable efforts of the Dutch as an example of what may be effected by industry and the love of liberty, and eulogises the plan of draining all the numerous marshes in France. He then alludes to the marsh at Beaucaire, the pond at Monguio, and other marshes in Languedoc, which before the revolution were granted to the inhabitants to drain them. This assignment to a company has since been renewed by Buonaparte; but the author insinuates that it is a dangerous speculation, that the perpetual enjoyment of the land reclaimed, and immunity from taxation, are not sufficient to indemnify the people for the enormous expense; and that the government should insure them indemnity! Under such circumstances, can we consider the proposal of draining the marshes and swamps of Languedoc, any other thing than a dream? Formerly, the author observes, the free flow of the waters of the Vistre and Vidourle into the marshes, effectually prevented the excess of their saline principles, so that their borders produced an abundant crop of reeds, making a very good

forage, and yielding an important revenue every year; while that, since the navigable canal has raised an insurmountable barrier between the latter and the marshes, they produce only rushes, and a coarse kind of reeds merely fit for litter. This, however, is not all: when the south winds raise the water of the sea, or when the rains are abundant, several fertile meadows are converted into marshes to a considerable distance. In this manner, during the last twenty years, an annual loss of more than a million of francs has been sustained. If the progress of this evil is not promptly and effectually stopped, the writer considers that the draining of marshes on the same principles, instead of being a great good, would, on the contrary, become the greatest misfortune. He proposes that the waters of these lakes should still be suffered to traverse the marshes, in order to regain the lost meadows. What is this but saying, "Let the marshes alone, they are the least evil which can exist." An enterprising genius would see no difficulty in draining and embanking both the lakes here mentioned. On the stubbing and clearing of woodlands, the author's remarks are much more judicious.

"The ardour with which, during the revolution [he exclaims], the people devoted themselves to the stubbing of woodlands in France, looked as if it were a country still uncultivated. It was said that for the first time the art of agriculture was revealed to its savage inhabitants, who, greedy of a new aliment, all hastened to fell trees and prepare a place to sow the grain which they wished to substitute to the acorn, which till then had alone composed their nourishment. In all times the spirit of invasion and rapine has principally signalised itself against the forests, as if their shade should eternally conceal these criminal enterprises, and shelter their authors from the just reprehension of the laws. When the police was in its greatest vigour, the most wise and rigid measures, and the most active vigilance, were scarcely sufficient to prevent usurpations and ravages; how much more then would they be extended when this check was removed! The police was destroyed the first thing in the political commotions, and shortly after the most ungoverned licentiousness was encouraged by an anarchical legislation, in which, at the side of some hypocritical dispositions of order and public good, were perfidiously placed the means of violating them.

"But what signifies it [asks the author] if, in stubbing woods and forests, some portion of their soil has been converted into arable land, or into vineyards? Besides, that such land is rarely fit for this use, is not the wood, in one respect or other, an object of primary necessity? Is it a merchandise, at least the fire-wood, the value of which can support the expense of a distant carriage? A few years more of dilapidation, and it will become an object of luxury! While that, in the department of Gard, the price of other articles of

consumption has scarcely advanced one third, that of wood has more than doubled, and that of pitcoal, which cannot always be found, has experienced a similar augmentation. Except impenetrable places in the country, the most remote from Cevennes, the department of Gard has nothing but vestiges of its woods. Every where the heights are stripped, and the rock is naked, for the soil, being no longer retained by the roots of trees on a sharp declivity, has been carried off by the waters, and has deceived by its fall the imprudent avidity of those who wished to usurp it. In short, this arid and sandy earth has fallen on a fertile soil, and covered it with a sterile stratum. Thus, in the *commune* [district] of *Connaux*, more than 150 *hectares* [near 300 acres] of fertile fields and meadows have been buried. But what COMMUNE has not experienced similar disasters? Enthusiasm for stubbing, excited by imprudent and ill-executed laws, became a furor, with which every one was affected without rule and without measure. They cut down from the heights the trees which formed the last rampart against the freezing impetuosity of the north-winds, and opened to their murderous invasion the plains and the lower sides of the hills. The destruction of the woods has likewise rendered the absorbent action of the winds more active, the evaporation more prompt and complete, and deprived the soil of all means of recovering its humidity.

" When *there is a deficiency of hands,* and all our country *experiences it,* as witness the *exorbitant price of day-labour,* the extension of tillage destroys good culture. Cultivate less and cultivate better, said justly the oracle of agriculture; and although his instructions have made some progress in the practice of this art, it is still good to repeat his counsel. The improvement of manure alone, especially in the department of Gard, would be a much greater advantage than the cultivation of all the waste lands. And in how many other respects is it necessary to learn to augment the product of the lands already cultivated? The use of the large plough is beginning to be introduced; lucerne is the only new plant which has been cultivated these hundred years; and no one has yet cultivated any of the numerous foreign productions which would vary and multiply the means of subsistence, and rest the soil in diversifying its crops. The art of improving is a secret which no one desires to know; cattle are bred without system and without intelligence; the pruning of trees is left to the most blind custom; the care of the forests is almost entirely neglected; and œnologia [the science of making wine?] is still in its infancy. It is therefore contrary to the interest of all to inclose and cultivate the moors, heaths, downs, and commons, wherever the present culture is capable of improvement; wherever labourers are scarce, and consequently the manure of cattle indispensable; and where employing wool in local manufactures doubles the riches of the country; wherever there are more vines than can be well cultivated, where too great abundance of wine establishes an injurious competition, and where the industry which is exercised on this liquor is less advantageous than that on other things. It is perhaps still more adverse to the interests of all to stub the forests or even the land covered with thickets and brambles, which with a little care can be converted into woods

in the countries where this combustible is scarce and dear—on the mountains or hills and in the plains desolated by the drought. In short, if the draining of marshes is useful, which in itself cannot be doubted, it must be but with the certainty acquired by success; it must be when it is ascertained that the product will surpass the expense, and that this draining will be effected by means which will not injure the lands already cultivated.

"These general principles, which reason avows and experience has consecrated, apply to the whole of France; they also apply particularly to the department of Gard, where it is time, high time, that in this respect we should cease to act as we might do in the forests and deserts of North America."

These observations are applicable only to France or Spain, where there is no other fuel than wood, and where it is as necessary to cultivate it for this purpose, as it is to sow grain for food. It is calculated that wood is fit for cutting to serve as fuel every ten years; and that during that time it must be protected from any external violence. But however the author's remarks, with regard to wood for fuel, may be dictated by common sense, they nevertheless depict in striking colours the miserable state and enormous depopulation of France. The want of cultivators of the soil is surely not one of the least evils of perpetual war, and it appears that the women are not now sufficiently numerous to cultivate the land, even in the most indifferent manner. It is true, if France produces little, she has few inhabitants to consume her produce; but such a state cannot be very permanent or very flourishing.

As it is usual in the French academies to pronounce in public and to print eulogies on their deceased members, accordingly we find two of these extravagant productions in this volume. These are from the pen of M. Vincens St. Laurent, the assistant-secretary.

The first details the life of "John-Mary-Anthony Griolet, who was born at Nismes the 5th September, 1763, and was successively advocat, councillor to the presidial Court of Nismes, king's commissioner for the organisation of the department of Gard, attorney-general syndic of this department, solicitor of the district near the municipality of Nismes; merchant, vice-president of the tribunal, and secretary to the Chambre of Commerce of Genoa; member of the ancient Royal Academy of Nismes, and non-resident member of that of Gard: he died at Genoa the 2d of March, 1806."

It would be tedious and disgusting to follow M. St. Laurent through his overstrained panegyric on M. Griolet, who received the rudiments of education in the same school which gave the celebrated Flechier to the church and to literature. As an advocate he is represented to have

founded all his proceedings on equity, and to have carried the same principles with him into the magistracy. We cannot, however, so much admire the equity of his critical judgment in his "Discourse on the Influence of Boileau," in which he does not hesitate to call him the "rival and vanquisher of Horace!" We agree with him however in his declaration, that "the moment in which Boileau shall lose the respect of men of letters, will be that of the decadence of taste." M. Griolet it appears was an intimate friend of the famous president of the National Convention, Boissy d'Anglas, of whom the eulogist relates the following anecdote, which happened when the Convention was attacked by the populace on the first of Prairal, An. 3.

"On that day, M. Boissy d'Anglas, justly apprehensive of his own fate when the head of one of his collegues was held up before him, was president when a decree of outlawry was passed against the mob. One of the leaders of the populace having procured a wet copy of the newly-printed decree, advanced with violence and held it up in his hand under the president's nose, exclaiming, 'Villain, 'behold thy work! it is little to make us die with hunger, thou 'wishest also to send us to the scaffold!' M. Boissy d'Anglas, taking this infuriate gently by the arm, and lowering it to remove the signal which would have drawn all the daggers upon him, coolly replied; 'Speak not of this decree at present; it might produce a bad effect.' The ruffian, astonished at this coolness, instantly lost his audacity, and, scarcely muttering a few words, disappeared. Another, who, though disguised as one of the mob appeared to conceal the character and language of a man of education, was one of the first and most obstinate of the besiegers of the Convention; having appeased his real or pretended fury, said to the president in a tone of reproach, 'Behold, however, to what your love of liberty has led!'

M. Griolet is represented as having been indefatigable in the discharge of his numerous official duties, and to have often converted the hours of repose into hours of study and labour. *Ce que j'ôte à mes nuits, je l'ajoute à mes jours* (what I take from my nights, I add to my days), was his efficient maxim; and during the revolutionary frenzy, when "crimes were authorised by the decrees of the senate and the will of the people," as Seneca observed on a similar occasion, M. Griolet's zeal induced him to take a very active part in order to have power sufficient to arrest or at least modify the vengeance of popular fury. This animated sketch of the horrors in which the country was plunged, and the extraordinary exertion and escapes of M. Griolet, who spent fifteen months in an obscure pea-

sant's cottage, will furnish another episode to the history of the French revolution. Afterwards he fled to the once-independent republic of Genoa, where he devoted his time to the study of botany, and at length commenced merchant, in which capacity he died. His success in botany may be ascertained from the circumstance that Dr. Schur called the *carex grisea* of Vivuani, *carex grioletii*, in honour of his successful labours in this science. But as his maxim was *cache ta vie*, he could not be induced to publish a little *Flora*, which he compiled during his residence in the country and at Genoa. Notwithstanding his persecutions, however, M. St. Laurent feels himself bound by truth to declare, that "M. Griolet was one of the most determined partisans of the philosophy of the 18th century, which has been so much calumniated. In his estimation, ignorance and unprincipledness were the sole causes of the disasters and crimes of the revolution." But had the leaders of that revolution better known their country, had they known more of human nature, they would not have been so foolish as to expect that ignorant and depraved men would act like wise and virtuous members of society, and would consequently have adopted other measures which would have been perhaps slower, but more effectual, in their operations of leading an extensive nation from slavery to a state of civil liberty. This want of attainable knowledge and even common foresight manifested by the revolutionary philosophers impeaches their judgment, and detracts from their reputation of possessing learning and talents. Events have proved them miserable sciolists in that branch of knowledge on which all true principles of legislation are founded.

The next eulogy is on "G. F. Brueys d'Aigalliers, who was born at Uzes the 28th of February, 1743, formerly major of the regiment of Angouleme and governor-general of the principality of Monaco; member of the Constituent Assembly, of the academies of Caen, Gard, of the Arcades of Rome, and of the Ricoverati of Padua. He died at Nismes the 2d of April, 1806." M. d'Aigalliers was a true Frenchman; and his eulogist informs us, that although bred a soldier, "religion, philosophy, morality, political economy, the military art, music, history, criticism, ancient and modern literature, and poetry, appear to have alternately occupied his thoughts and his pen." Among the most interesting of this universal writer's works, of which a selection has been published, is a flimsy account of St. Do-

mingo, which has the merit of containing a few personal observations of the author. His opinion of Madam Sevigny's letters is the most extravagant of any which we have ever seen. They formed the subject of his incessant meditation; and he considered these neat, but certainly not elegant, trifles, to be the most proper for "learning the language, ornamenting the mind, forming the style, giving the tone of good company, furnishing a fund of conversation, rendering one economical without avarice, and attentive to his interest without severity and injustice; making one mild and complaisant in society without flattery or meanness, easy in the commerce of life without deceit; polishing the manners; in short, inspiring just ideas of religion either to know or practise it." After this specimen of M. d'Aigalliers's philosophy, and his approbation of the religion of a furious *St. Bartholomewizer* (if we may adopt a word), our readers perhaps will not be very curious to know much more of his life and works. We do not however doubt that M. d'Aigalliers was a very tender-hearted and humane man, although neither a philosopher nor a statesman.

The preceding extracts and remarks will enable our readers to form a tolerably just idea of the state of science and literature in the south or protestant part of France, which was always more enlightened and more ingenious than the bigotted popish parts. There is not, we believe, any other academy at present out of Paris, which could produce a volume even so respectable as this in France.

Memoires et Lettres du Maréchal de Tessé, &c.

Memoirs and Letters of Marshal de Tessé, containing Anecdotes and unknown historical Facts in a Part of the Reigns of Lewis XIV. and Lewis XV. 2 Vols. 8vo. Paris. Treuttel and Würtz.

IT cannot be doubted that the memoirs which General Grimoard and others have published of the military officers who distinguished themselves during the reign, perhaps we might still say age, of Lewis XIV., have contributed very essentially to illustrate the history of Europe during that period. Their publication at present must also be advantageous to the general welfare, as all of them manifest the systematic ambitious views of France to have been the same then as in the present day, and consequently that

her aggrandisement must be prejudicial to all the other nations of Europe. The subject of these Memoirs has been represented, by the rigorous Duke of St. Simon, as a perfidious, ungrateful, and supple courtier, suspected by all parties, a soldier ignorant of the art of war, a venal sycophant of little talents, and degrading his hereditary noble rank by his meanness to his inferiors. Without having a very exalted opinion of the marshal's virtue, it is evident that this character is extravagant and malignant in the extreme, as will appear in reading these Memoirs.

Mans John Baptist René de Froullaï, Count of Tessé, was born in 1651, and from his earliest age evinced much vivacity and spirit. He entered the army, and served his first campaign as aid-de-camp to Marshal Crequi in 1669, in Lorraine, when he was slightly wounded at the siege of Epinal in 1670. His brother, the Chevalier de Tessé, with whom he always lived in habits of affection, served with him in the same regiment till he obtained successively the rank of captain and colonel. In 1674 he married the only daughter of Baron d'Aunai, a Norman noble. After raising a regiment of dragoons he passed to Roussilon, then to Sicily, and distinguished himself on the Rhine under Marshal Crequi in 1677. He was then raised to the rank of brigadier of dragoons, became acquainted with Marquis Louvois, obtained the command of Dauphiny, and was advanced to the rank of colonel-general of dragoons. At the bloody revocation of the edict of Nantes, he had a military mission as chief of the well-named *dragonades*. His conduct in this sanguinary office is said to have been more humane than that of many of the military missionaries. His clemency, however, was probably to be ascribed, in some measure, to his having been sent to act against the people of the petty principality of Orange, which in fact still belonged to King William, and which Lewis the Fourteenth only held in sequestration, and over which he had no more legal right than Buonaparte possesses over the states he thinks proper to subjugate to his will. Had the Prince of Orange done his duty, he would have obliged the proud and bigotted Lewis XIV. to have guaranteed the people the free exercise of their religion, before he had ceded them to France.

In 1691, the Chevalier de Tessé, brother of the Count, attained the rank of field-marshal, and went to Ireland under the orders of lieutenant-general St. Ruth. The field-marshal distinguished himself at the battle of Aughrim, where

he was wounded, and St. Ruth killed. He succeeded in rallying the French cavalry, retreated to Galway, and afterwards to Limerick, where, as Lieutenant-General to King James, he capitulated with King William, and took with him to France twelve or fifteen thousand Irish catholics, who did not wish to remain under the heretic domination of William III. During this time, Count de Tessé performed several campaigns in Italy and Flanders, under the virtuous Marshal Catinat. Here we discover the first traces of the treachery of Tessé, who intrigued with the Minister, and secretly availed himself of Catinat's views to ingratiate himself at court, by an attempt to detach the Vaudese from the service of the Duke of Savoy. From this time Count de Tessé was chiefly occupied in negociating and intriguing with the Court of Turin, where the Countess de Verrue informed him, in the true spirit of a Frenchwoman, of all the petty gossip in the ducal palace. Of the zeal of this intriguant to serve the minister of her country, an idea may be formed from the following question, with which she concludes a very long letter: *Devinez d'où je vous écris? de ma chaise percée!* Yet we shall be told the French were a polite people.

From 1696 till 1704, we find Count de Tessé alternately fighting, negociating, and intriguing, in Savoy and Piedmont. His defence of Pignerol, which was so vigorously besieged by the Duke of Savoy and his allies, constitutes one of his most brilliant achievements. But his incessant intrigues, his artifices to recommend himself to the king, his efforts to acquire favour from those in power, his sycophancy and activity, altogether render tehese memoirs and letters not a little curious, as exhibiting some new views of the greatness and the littleness of human nature. It is impossible to form a correct notion of his real character from any one of his letters; they must all be read attentively, after which the reader will hesitate to say what quality most predominated in the man, except that of *currying favour with the great*, to use a very vulgar, but very characteristic expression. His life exhibits such a strange heterogeneous mixture of bravery and cowardice, of talents and silliness, vanity and servility, ambition and humbleness, levity and steadiness, indecision and perseverance, honour and villainy; of sincerity, frankness, and duplicity; of virtue without morality, and morality without integrity; of thoughtlessness and design, of power without greatness, and greatness without dignity. If the reader conceive something of all these contrarieties, he will have a tolerable conception of the character of the French Marshal Count de Tessé. The account of his intrigues and campaigns

in Spain during the war of the succession in 1705-6, &c. contains some interesting particulars on the *defensibility* of Estremadura and Andalusia, including Gibraltar and Cadiz, which are worthy of attention at the present crisis, but which we must defer till our next appendix.

Sull' preteso Fenomeno della Incombustibilità.

Memoir on the pretended phenomenon of Incombustibility. By Lewis Sementini, M. D. Senior Professor of Chemistry in the Royal University of Naples. 4to. Naples.

THE circumstance of a man pretending to be invulnerable by fire, naturally excited the curiosity of all classes of people on the continent, whether in Spain, his native country, or in France, Germany, and Italy. The foreign journals have been often occupied with long details of the extraordinary performances of Senor Lionetto, who can handle red hot iron, drink boiling oil, wash his hands in melted lead, and put some of it into his mouth, walk over red hot bars of iron, or hold them between his teeth, wash his face in nitric acid (the aqua fortis of commerce) and hold his face over the vapours of nitric or sulphuric acids thrown on the fire. Such exhibitions have been made in presence of all the French philosophers in Paris, but without any attempt on their part to explain the means by which they were effected, till this Spaniard presented himself in Naples to repeat his fiery experiments.

Dr. Sementini placing himself as near as possible to the operator, minutely observed all his performances, and when he passed a plate of red hot iron over his hair, a dense white vapour arose, which induced the doctor to conclude that some previous means had been used to render it incombustible. Under this impression he began to experiment on himself, and rubbed his skin with acids and acidulous salts. These after repeated trials he found effectual; and by means of numerous frictions with dilute sulphurous acid, he could pass a plate of red hot iron over the part without experiencing any injury. As a powerful non-conductor of heat he next had recourse to common alum, and by burning it in order to increase its styptiicity, and making a saturated solution of this salt, was able in a short time to render his tongue, or any other part to which it was repeatedly applied, perfectly able to resist the action of red hot iron. This effect he found increased considerably by the use of soap, with which he afterwards rubbed his tongue or that part of his skin which came in contact with the hot iron, melted lead, or boiling oil. In all these experiments,

however, in which the doctor succeeded as perfectly as Lionetto himself, it was found that the incombustibility could only be carried to a certain length, and that the skin of both the Spaniard and Dr. Sementini could resist the action of the heat only for a certain time; which, however, was quite sufficient for the public exhibition of the performance. The fact of Lionetto's actually swallowing the boiling oil, Dr. S. explains by stating that when the oil was burning he put a piece of lead into it, which melted and consequently surprised the spectators while it cooled the oil, after which he dexterously dropped a small quantity of it in this state on his tongue, where it remained for some time before he swallowed it. The doctor thinks this sufficiently explains the apparent phenomenon, as his tongue was covered with a thick crust which he concludes to have been made of a thin layer of sugar over which soap was rubbed.

The above are the principal facts in this very curious and interesting little essay, which the author professes to continue more at length in a subsequent chemico-physiological examination of all the phenomena in question. The present paper, however, is fully sufficient to enable any person to make the experiment on himself, only it must be remembered that the part of the skin submitted to the process here detailed will become hard and less sensible than the other parts of the body. It will not indeed continue so unless by repeated application of the same frictions.

Verklaring van Paulus brief aan de Romeinen.

Commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. By Paul Bosveld, Ancient Pastor of Dordregt, pp. 438, 8vo. Dordregt or Dort.

HOLLAND has long been a hotbed of extravagant notions in religion, and its present calamities are more likely to increase than diminish such reveries as have bewildered Swedenborg and the Hernhuters. *Homo doctus semper in se divitias habet,* and their commercial poverty has not yet totally destroyed their literary wealth, though it is also very fast declining. Mr. Bosveld, however, is an old and learned hermeneutical divine, who, without bewildering himself with the prophecies, has very ably and judiciously explained several of the Epistles of St. Paul. In the present commentary he determines the date of this epistle to the Romans to be in the first months of the fifty-fourth year of the Christian era, by an investigation of the character and situation of the persons to whom it

was addressed, and the occasion which gave rise to it. A second volume of this work has been published, but has not yet come to hand: had we a better opinion of the industry of our divines, we would say it is worth their perusal. In catholic countries, where theological disquisitions are little understood, it will be of more utility.

Acte d'Accusation de Georges, Pichegru, Moreau, &c.

Act of Accusation (Bill of Inditement) against Georges, Pichegru, Moreau, and others, accused of Conspiracy against the Person of the First Consul, and against the external and internal safety of the Republic. pp. 448, 8vo. Paris.

THIS volume, although published by the French government, furnishes a memorable example of the true character of French justice. No one fact alleged in the inditement is proved; nothing but circumstances are established on any rational basis, and had Horne Tooke and his associates been tried and judged by Frenchmen and French laws in the same manner, they would all have been condemned. It is scarcely possible to find a more striking instance of a court deciding and condemning merely on its own internal conviction, without any evidence whatever; in other words, of a court deciding on what, in the true sense of the word, is properly called *prejudice!*

To this volume have been appended, the "Judgment of the Criminal Tribunal of the Seine, relative to the suicide (that is, murder) of Pichegru," and also letters purporting, but without any internal or external evidence, to be written by a Mr. Drake. To those who interest themselves in collecting documents of the "bloody annals" of Buonaparte, these papers will be highly interesting.

De la Semiologie buccale ou exposé des signes qù'on trouve à la bouche, &c.

On buccal Semiology, or Exposition of the symptoms in the Mouth, which shew the cachexy and numerous diseases which it occasions, those which it induces as well as those with which it is combined, whether in the teeth or in all the other parts of the Body. By L. Laforgue, expert Dentist. 8vo. Paris.

THE French quacks are so much superior to the English, that they can almost all write their language better than the

English write theirs. The title of this work is no mean specimen of the art of deception, and the volume itself a tolerable advertisement for a dentist. Our *Chevalier* Ruspinis can produce nothing like this.

Henrici Collot d'Escury, J. U. D. Carminum Fasciculus alter. Munus amiris. pp. 82, 8vo. Dort or Dordregt.

M. d'Escury's Latin verses have been very well received, and they certainly possess considerable grace and easiness. From this second collection we shall extract that devoted to celebrate the fame of our countryman, in the fortunate discovery of vaccination: it is intitled,

"JENNERUS.

"Lernæâ hic domuit monstrum crudelius hydrâ,
Et stygio eripuit tela cruenta Jovi.
Dulcia gestantes ulnis hinc pignora matres,
Et proli adrideno cum genetrice pater,
Jennerum celebrant; Jennero altaria ponunt;
Jennerum magni numinis instar habent.
Succrescens proles, et postera turba per ævum,
Hunc merito patrem dixerit esse suum.
Plurima servatam referens huic fœmina formam,
Idaliis sparget tempora docta rosis.
Anglia nequicquam tali tu cive superbis:
Vindicat hunc orbis, quâ patet ille, sibi."

Mr. Pickering's Speech in the Senate of the United States, on the Resolution offered by Mr. Hillhouse to repeal the several Acts laying an Embargo, November 30, 1808.

WE have been so fortunate as to obtain possession of the only copy of this valuable document which has reached England. It requires no elucidation, no comments; it speaks for itself. Our readers will find in it an ample confirmation of all our sentiments respecting the American government: and it fortunately comes in time to shew the fallacy and the impolicy of such a motion as that which LORD AUCKLAND has announced in the name of LORD GRENVILLE. The act of issuing the orders in council was the wisest measure which the government ever adopted; they have preserved our commerce, and saved our colonies from ruin; and, we trust, that neithe the voice of mistaken policy, the declamations of party, nor the clamours of faction, will shake the resolution of ministers,

or induce them to swerve in the smallest degree from that system of which these orders form a part.

"MR. PRESIDENT,

"THE ample discussion already given to the resolution on your table, leaves me nothing to detail on the *effects*, produced by the embargo, in regard to France, to England, or ourselves. On the two great belligerents, *practical* men, who knew the characters and resources of those nations, foresaw and pronounced, *that it would make no impression.* This we all now know to be the fact: while we ourselves severely feel its pressure. Why, then, not remove it? Because, as we are told, those two nations have violated our neutral maritime rights; and seeing, that to compel their respect for these, we imposed the embargo, and they treat the measure with contempt; to remove it would be submission. So we will endeavour to conceal our mortification; and because we cannot injure *them* we will continue to punish *ourselves.* To renew our commerce, while their decrees and orders remain uncancelled, would, we are told, be 'abject and degrading submission:' and that we have but this alternative, 'to make war with both nations,' or 'continue and enforce the present suspension of commerce.'

"It has been justly remarked, by the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. Hillhouse] that to run away and abandon our rights, is abject and degrading.

"To make war on both the belligerents, is the most strange, quixotic idea that ever entered into the head of a statesman. I suppose, as we have a thousand and a thousand times declared, that we have maintained an impartial neutrality towards those nations, so, to verify our declarations, we must now make war upon both, *impartially!* And as their injuries are said to be equal, or, we will not inquire which has done us 'the most harm;' so we must measure out to each an equal quantity of resentment, and give to each an equal number of blows!

"In respect to our violated rights, so far as Great Britain is concerned, those presented by the administration in the front of our claims, are

"I. An exemption from impressment of all seamen on board our merchant vessels.

"II. A free trade with the colonies of her enemies.

"III. An exemption from capture of our vessels destined for any port of her enemies not actually blockaded.

"I am aware, sir, of the consequences of advancing any thing from which conclusions may be drawn adverse to the opinions of our own administration, which by many are conceived to be indisputably just. Merely to state these questions, and to mention such arguments as the British government may perhaps have urged in their support, on her side, is sufficient to subject a man to the popular charge of being under British influence, or to the vulgar slander of being a 'British tory:' he will be fortunate to escape the accu-

sation of touching British gold. But, sir, none of these things move me. The patrons of the miscreants who utter these slanders know better: but are nevertheless willing to benefit by the impression they may make on the minds of the people. From an early period of my life, I was zealously engaged in every measure opposed to the attempts of Great Britain to encroach upon our rights, until the commencement of our revolutionary war; and during its whole continuance, I was uninteruptedly employed in important civil or military departments; contributing all my efforts to bring that war to a successful termination.

"I, sir, am not the advocate of wrong doers, to whatever country they belong; whether emperors or kings, or the administrators of a republic. JUSTICE is my object, and TRUTH my guide; and wherever SHE points the way, I shall not fear to go.

"Great Britain has done us many wrongs. When we were colonies, she attempted to deprive us of some of our dearest birth-rights; rights derived from our English ancestors; rights which we defended and finally established by the successful conclusion of the revolutionary war. But these wrongs, and all the wounds of war, were intended to be obliterated and healed by the treaty of peace, when all enmities should have ceased.

"Great Britain wronged us in the capture and condemnation of our vessels under her orders of 1793: and she has made reparation for these wrongs; pursuant to a treaty negociated on *practical* principles, by a statesman who with *liberal views* and *real candour*, sought adjustment and reparation.

"At subsequent periods she has committed other wrongs: and if reparation had been demanded in the same spirit of candour and firmness which were manifested in 1794, that distinguished precedent authorizes the opinion, that a like equitable adjustment and reparation might have been obtained. But after a four year's negociation, in which volumes of letters and essays have been written, it has, like the seven year's negociation with Spain, been brought (in the language of the president) 'to an issue of some sort:' that is, every subject of dispute remains as far, probably farther from adjustment, than when the negociations were begun.

"It is this disastrous issue which now enters into our deliberations. According to the statements of the administration, we are brought into a situation from which we cannot advance without war, nor retreat without dishonour. Their negociations with France have also terminated in mortification and defeat.

"On the two questions of the impressment of seamen on board our merchant vessels, and a trade with the enemies of Great Britain prohibited in time of peace, the gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. Smith] was pleased to read some parts of a letter written by me last winter to the governor of Massachusetts, to be laid before the legislature; and on the latter (neutral trade) he also read the journal of the senate, which exhibited a unanimous vote declaratory of our right to that trade; and then the names of the senators (mine being

one) who voted to request the president to demand and insist on reparation for the injuries done us in violation of that right; *and for this purpose to enter into* amicable arrangements *with the British government.*

"On these two questions, I should add nothing to the observations made yesterday by the gentleman from Connecticut, but for the apparent intention of the gentleman from Maryland, to exhibit an inconsistency between my votes in the senate and the observations of my letter on the same subject.

"It is sufficient for me to remark, that in the passages recited by the gentleman from my letter, my object was to shew, by exhibiting in a few words, to the view of my immediate constituents, and through them to the people of Massachusetts, some of the reasons which might have influenced Great Britain not to relinquish her ancient usage of impressing *her own seamen*; nor to consent that neutral vessels should carry on (as we and other neutrals were carrying on) the whole trade between the countries of her enemies in Europe and their colonies; to show, I say, that as much was to be said on both sides, those rights, as claimed by the United States, were not to be considered so clear and indisputable *as to justify a war with Great Britain;* into which the proceedings of the executive, in a variety of ways, seemed calculated to plunge us.

"Before I quit this subject, I will make one more observation. It appears to be generally supposed that the rule respecting the colonial trade adopted by Great Britain, and usually called the rule of 1756, which it seems she has considered as 'the ancient and established principle of maritime law*,' was peculiar to Great Britain: and Mr. Madison says, 'it is well known that Great Britain is the only nation that has acted upon, or otherwise given a sanction to it†.' He also mentions this rule as having been introduced, for the first time in the war of 1756; as having been in operation only a few years in that war; and not afterwards acted upon until 1793‡. Let us examine the subject.

"In Valin's celebrated work on maritime law (a book in the secretary of state's office) is a regulation of Louis the fourteenth, in 1704, from which I will recite some passages.

"The title of the regulation is remarkable: it is 'concerning prizes made at sea, *to secure the navigation of neutral states and allies during war;*' implying that this regulation was intended to abate the rigor of maritime law before that time practised towards neutral commerce.

"After observing that propositions had been made to him by the deputies of the council of commerce, the French king expresses his approbation of them, 'seeing he finds in them the means which he has always sought of procuring equally the advantages of the

---

"* Mr. Madison's letter of March 25, 1808, to Mr. Erskine.

† Same letter. ‡ Idem.

subjects of neutral princes and French cruizers.' He adds, 'The subjects of neutral princes will thus find the care which his majesty has taken to preserve for them *the same extent and the same liberty of commerce which they have been accustomed to enjoy during peace.*'

"I will now read such of the articles of this French regulation as relate to the question under examination.

"'*Article* 1. His Majesty forbids French privateers to stop or bring into the ports of his kingdom, vessels belonging to subjects of neutral princes, going from the ports of their dominion, and laden on account of the owners or other subjects of the said neutral princes, with merchandize of the growth or manufacture of their own country, to carry the same *directly* into any other states whatsoever, even those with which his Majesty is at war; provided nevertheless, that there be not in the said vessels any contraband goods.

"'*Article* 2. They are in like manner forbidden to stop vessels belonging to subjects of neutral princes, going from the ports of any state whatsoever, even of those with which his Majesty is at war, and laden on account of the owners or other subjects of the said neutral princes, with merchandize which they shall have received in the same country or state whence they shall have departed, to return *directly* into the ports of the dominion of their sovereign.

"'*Article* 3. He also forbids them to stop vessels belonging to the subjects of neutral princes, departing from the ports of one of the states neutral or allied to his Majesty, to go into another state alike neutral or allied to his Majesty; provided they are not laden with merchandise of the growth or manufacture of his enemies; in which case the merchandise shall be good prize, and the vessels shall be released.

"'*Article* 4. In like manner his Majesty forbids privateers to stop vessels belonging to subjects of neutral princes departing from a state allied to his majesty or neutral, to go to a state the enemy of his majesty; provided there be not on board said vessel any merchandize contraband, nor of the growth or manufacture of the enemies of his majesty; in which cases the merchandize shall be good prize, and the vessels shall be released.

"'*Article* 6. Vessels belonging to subjects of neutral states which shall depart from the ports of a state the enemy of his majesty, and there have taken their lading, in whole or in part, to go to the states of any other prince than their own, whether allied to his Majesty, neutral or enemy, may be stopped and brought into his kingdom, and shall be declared good prize with their lading, even although laden on account of the subjects of his Majesty, or of an allied or neutral state.'

"This regulation of Louis XIV. in 1704, (he being then at war with England and Holland) was re-enacted with Louis XV. in 1744, (France being again at war with England) with some exceptions in

regard to those neutral nations with whom France had formed treaty-stipulations incompatible with that regulation.

"In these five articles we have, if I mistake not, the whole doctrine of the British rule of 1756. The *direct* trade to and from *neutral* ports and the enemy's ports, being permitted! but not the trade to and from the ports of one allied or neutral state, to and from the ports of another allied or neutral state; *if the lading of the neutral vessels consist of merchandize, the productions of the enemy's country*; much less to carry the same from one port of the enemy, to another port of the enemy.

"The PRINCIPLE of the British rule and of the French regulation appears to be, to prevent *neutrals* coming in *to aid* the enemy in the commerce of one part of his dominions with any other part thereof, or in procuring a market for the enemy's productions, in any other country than that of the neutral actually transporting the same, *and for its own use and consumption.*

"It appears, moreover, by the preamble to the French regulation, that the restrictions on neutral commerce, which we are now examining, instead of commencing in 1756, were in exercise by the English and Dutch, antecedent to that regulation, and with greater rigour; the French king professing to *ameliorate* the condition of neutral commerce, by that regulation *.

"* But Great Britain has admitted that the vessels of the United States might carry on an *indirect* trade from the European dominions of her enemies to their colonies, and from those colonies to their parent countries in Europe; and in both cases, the trade has been considered *indirect* when carried on through the United States: that is, when the cargoes laden on board American vessels, in the ports of the enemies of Great Britain, have been first imported into the United States, and carried thence in the same or other American vessels, to the enemy's countries, or colonies respectively. But the facts which should constitute an *indirect* trade, not having been definitively declared; on the contrary, as they have been several times varied, either by the orders of the British government, or by the decision of her Courts of Admiralty—much vexation and injury have thence accrued to the commerce of the United States.

"But the treaty negociated by the President's ministers, (Messrs. Monroe and Pinkney) and signed by them, with the British commissioners on the 31st of December, 1806, comprehended a definitive provision on this head. Such trade, between the parent countries and colonies of the enemies of Great Britain, was to be considered *indirect*, when the articles of the growth, produce or manufacture of Europe, were first carried to the United States; and on re-exportation, remained after the drawback, subject to a duty of one per cent. on their value. In like manner, all articles of the growth and produce of the enemy's colonies, being first brought to the

"On the subject of blockade, when vessels of war were not so stationed before the port declared to be blockaded, as to constitute what is called an *actual blockade*, undoubtedly abuses have taken place.

"To form an actual blockade of a port, ships destined for that object, must be 'sufficiently near to produce an evident danger in entering.' But these words by no means imply a *certainty* of *capture* by the blockading ships, of the vessel so attempting to enter. What degree of risk from blockading ships will amount to a lawful blockade, may sometimes be a disputable question. Would the chance of capturing three vessels out of four, or seven out of eight, exhibit such an 'evident danger in entering,' as would constitute an actual blockade? that is, when to insure their entering in safety would be worth a premium of from 75 to 90 per cent. This must remain a question of some difficulty to adjust.

"On these points, sir, and all others in dispute with Great Britain, my opinion remains unchanged, that they are yet proper subjects of negociation, to be undertaken in the *real spirit* of *conciliation* and *adjustment*. That the *embargo* will not induce her to yield to our demands, we have ample proof, not only in the answer of the British government to our minister in London, but in the certain ability of that nation and her colonies to supply all their own wants. That she possessed the means, I think, has been demonstrated by gentlemen who have spoken before me. We have heard much of the patriotism and patient endurance of our fellow citizens, under the distresses of the embargo; and gentlemen speak confidently, that this patience will hold out till Great Britain shall be brought to our feet. At the same time, they calculate on the distresses, which they fondly imagine the embargo will inflict on the people of Great Britain and her colonies, to excite discontents and insurrections sufficiently alarming to induce that government to abandon usages on which she relies to maintain her maritime ascendency, and, at this time, her independence as a nation. But why should it be supposed that the people of Great Britain will be less patient under sufferings, than the people of the United States? Their's would arise from causes beyond their controul; our's from

---

United States, and there entered and landed, and on re exportation remaining subject to a duty of two per cent. on their value, might be re-laden, and freely exported to any country in Europe. The duties in both cases, to be paid into the treasury of the United States.

"This arrangement was calculated to prevent any further dispute between the United States and Great Britain, about the trade between the countries of her enemies in Europe and their colonies. But the President thought fit to reject this treaty, without laying it before the Senate."

some cause or causes operating on our *rulers*, but which the *people* can neither see nor understand. Within four months after the embargo was imposed, the President himself, by proclamation, announced to us and to the world, the existence of one insurrection, occasioned by the embargo; and the provisions made in the supplementary acts, to compel obedience at the point of the bayonet, shew how apprehensive the government were of discontents and resistance. These extraordinary provisions for the execution of a *specific measure* demonstrate, that it was considered as *opposed to the general sense of the people;* and, in a free country, such a measure cannot long be carried into execution. The votes of approbation of the embargo by public bodies, and other assemblies of citizens, so ostentatiously displayed, while they manifest the *force of party*, are, to say the least, but equivocal indications of the general sense of the people, or even of the individuals composing those assemblies. Those votes have always had fewer *hearts* than *voices*.

"Mr. President, the gentleman from Maryland mentioned the extreme danger to which our commerce would be exposed, while the French decrees and British orders remain unrepealed. It has been often said, and perhaps oftener insinuated, in newspapers and pamphlets, that if our vessels were permitted to go to sea, *all would be taken*. What escaped the French, would be captured by the English; and what escaped the latter, would fall a prey to the former. There is a want of truth in all this. The same gentleman quoted a statement made by an eminent merchant of Massachusetts, [Mr. Gray, of Salem] that of eight or ten vessels which sailed about the time the embargo was laid, one only had reached the place of her destination. I remember seeing a statement of that sort; and I think also, that I saw a *detection* of its *fallacy*. If they had not reached their destined ports, it did not follow that they were captured and condemned.

"The same merchant has expressed his decided opinion, 'that, notwithstanding the French decrees and British orders in council, if our embargo was off, we should have *more trade* than would be enjoyed by us, if all the world were at peace, and the respective nations should monopolize as much of their own commerce as usual.' Another eminent merchant [Mr. Thorndike, of Beverly] expressed, at the same time, the same opinion.

"But without resting the question on *opinions*, we may appeal to *facts*. I have sought information of the risks which have attended our foreign trade, within the present year, from the two principal districts of Massachusetts.

"By the statement in my hand, lately received, and which is of unquestionable authority, I find, that at one insurance office in Boston, 43 policies have been written, on vessels engaged in foreign voyages, since the first of January, 1808. Of these,

5 were undetermined.

1 vessel (the Neutrality) bound from Marseilles to Boston, cap-

tured and condemned at Gibraltar, for violating the blockade declared by the British orders in council.

37 arrived safely. In all 43.

"It is stated, that there were three policies on the Neutrality; and that possibly there might be more than one policy on one vessel among the 37 safe arrivals.

"At another office in Boston, out of 75 risks, principally to the West Indies,

3 vessels were captured by the French, of which the British recaptured 2.

1 captured by the British, supposed to be French property.

16—about this number are undetermined; and the rest, about

55, have ended safely. In all 75.

"At another office in Boston, out of somewhat more than 100 risks,

4 vessels were captured by the British, of which 2 were condemned for breach of orders in council; 1 probably enemy's property, and 1 remained under adjudication.

1 captured and condemned by the French; and

1 seized by them at Alicant, while they had the power there.

25 risks were undetermined; and the remainder ended safely.

"The premiums of insurance have been about eleven per cent. to and from the West Indies, for the whole voyage.

7 per cent. from the West Indies, with cargo on board.

9 to 10 per cent. from Europe, if not violating British orders.

4 to 5 per cent, *from* Europe, against *French* capture only.

"By a statement received from Salem, on the correctness of which I can rely, I find that in the district of Salem and Beverly, 22 vessels sailed, by the President's permission, between the 5th of April and the 10th of August. Of these vessels, one sailed to Sumatra, one to Senegal, and the rest to the different ports in the West Indies. Of the whole number,

1 returned leaky, and remained at home.

12 returned in safety; and

9 remained undetermined; but it was not known that any of them had been detained or condemned by any foreign power. In all 22.

"The insurance on the Sumatra voyage, out and home, was 14 per cent.

"Martinico,
"Havanna,
"Surinam,
} The voyage out and home, 9 to 10 per cent.

"Havanna, at and from, $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

"The premium of insurance from Calcutta to the United States, the last summer and autumn, has been 8 per cent.

"Thus, Mr. President, we see that the risk on our foreign trade has been very little increased since the issuing of the French decree of Berlin, and the British orders in council.

"The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Smith] asks—What would

have been the insurance on an American vessel bound to France? I am not informed. Perhaps 75 to 90 per cent. though it is not probable that our merchants would hazard their vessels on such a voyage, or that the underwriters would insure them. But what does this prove? Why, that the risk, under the British orders, is so great, in attempting to enter a port in France, as perhaps to amount to an actual blockade.

"I now beg leave, sir, to communicate the information I have recently received from the latter of the two merchants before referred to *. Having requested of him the data on which his opinion before mentioned was founded, he has sent me an answer, (dated the 23d instant) from which I will read the material parts.

"He says, 'respecting the comparative trade of profound peace, and the present moment, if the embargo should be removed, and the decrees and orders of council remain, it is a subject about which it is difficult to go into that detail which will shew satisfactorily an exact result; because, if you resort to the exports of a year in time of profound peace, and compare the aggregate with a year in war, the prices being so different, the difference in amount will not give the exact data we want. And to take the quantity of each article of export will not be satisfactory; because in different years we export more of the same article to the same market, and in proportion to the increased quantity raised, or the goodness or badness of the crop. But of the *fact* I have no doubt, that our trade would be much greater and more productive, if the embargo were removed, than it can be in time of peace; because when the colonial trade of the European powers is confined as usual, we cannot carry any kind of provisions to the colonies of any of them, without being subject to a heavy duty, nearly equal to a prohibition. And we are not allowed to bring away any thing but rum and molasses; and of course we lose the whole of the colonial trade, so far as respects importing any articles with a view of exporting them again; excepting only from the Isle of France, and Bourbon, which has generally been free. But we may be shut out there. The trade to the colonies is now free for all exports and imports with small duties. And if the largest and most natural European markets for the sale of colonial produce are occluded, still we have open to us, *all* that the British have, and we can now carry those articles to Sweden, Spain, Portugal, Coast of Barbary, Turkey, Sicily, Sardinia, and Malta; the three last of which are ports at which the articles sell high, and are bought for the purpose of smuggling over to the Continent, where they are sent in great quantities.

"The following statement is then given, of the amount of our exports from the 30th of September, 1806, to September 30, 1807, (taken from the report of the secretary of the treasury to countries

---

* "Mr. Thorndike."

and places other than those in Europe which are under the government or controul, or in alliance with the French emperor; all which are considered as shut up by the British orders in council.

	dollars.
"Domestic exports (or of articles of the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States,	36,109,991
"Foreign goods exported - - - - -	24,140,495
	60,250,486
"To this may be added Spanish dollars, exported to India and China, and which are not noticed in the report of the secretary of the treasury, and may be estimated at least at, - - - - - - -	6,000,000
Whole amount,	66,250,486

"This amount may be exported without being subject to the British orders of council: and the extra premiums against *French captures*, would not exceed the following rates, viz.

"To Sweden, 2 per cent.—Swedish and other West Indies, and the Spanish Main, 5 do.—Cape of Good Hope, 4 do.—England, Scotland, without the Channel, say Liverpool, Greenock, Ireland, &c. &c. 4 do.—And within the Channel, 6 do.—Guernsey, Jersey, &c. 5 do.—Gibraltar, 3 do.—Spanish ports in the Bay of Biscay, 6 do.—Spanish ports on the Atlantic, 3 do.—Spanish ports on the Mediterranean, 5 do.—Madeira, the Canaries, Fayal, and other Azores, 3 do.—Portugal, 3 do.—Cape de Verd, 3 do.—Sicily, 5 do.—Malta, 6 do.—China, 4 do.—Sumatra, 3 do.—Spanish and Portuguese America, 3 do.—Calcutta, and the Coast of Coromandel and Malabar, 5 do.—Africa, 4 do.—Arabia, and Red Sea, including Mocha, and Muscat, 4 do.—Manilla, 4 do.—North West Coast of America, 2 do.—Halifax and Newfoundland, 1 do.

"In time of profound peace, our trade might be fairly estimated thus:—

	Domestic Exports.	*Foreign Exports.*
	dollars.	
	48,699,592	Nothing.
"To which may be added specie to China and India,	6,000,000	In time of peace these must be so very inconsiderable as to be unimportant in this statement.
	54,699,592	

"This is supposing the same domestic articles as were exported in 1806, and allowing them to be at the same prices; so that the comparison stands thus:—

	dollars.
"Our exports, if the embargo were removed, would be, - - - - - - -	66,250,486
"Free from any embarrassment from the British orders in council.	
"If peace were to take place, and the European nations assume their trade as usual; and the prices of our domestic articles remain as the average prices in 1806, (which they would not) we should export, - - - - - - - - -	54,699,592
Leaving,	11,550,894

less export trade in time of peace than we might now enjoy; and which amount is to be twice water-borne, once in importing it from the places of growth, and again in carrying it to the consumers: and of course would employ shipping appertaining to the carriage of one freight, equal in amount to more than twenty-three millions, one hundred thousand dollars.

"As an evidence of the correctness of this statement, it will be seen, by a recurrence to the statement of the secretary of the treasury for the year 1803, that the exports had fallen, in that short peace, from 93,020,513, to 55,8000,033 dollars.

"It is to be observed, that we might now enjoy a trade to South America and the Spanish Main, which might be estimated, at least, at from four to five millions of dollars, a considerable part of which would be again exported to Spain and Portugal, and which has never made any part of the secretary's report; because the trade to those countries has been prohibited until lately. It may also be remembered, that the export trade does not shew the whole advantage of the colonial trade which we might now enjoy; because all we import for our own consumption ought to be added.

"[Here Mr. Lloyd stated, that in his opinion the value of the trade which might now be prosecuted from the United States, considering the present circumstances of the great nations of Europe, would be as extensive as could be carried on after a general peace, and the adoption, by the European powers, of their restrictive colonial systems.]

"On this clear and interesting view of the commerce which the United States might carry on, were the embargo out of the way, no comments are necessary. The observations of the writer of the letter are evidences of his being master of the subject.

"Mr. President, the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. Giles] has been pleased to attribute the discontents, in New England, especially in Massachusetts, relative to the embargo, solely to the arts of *demagogues*, who wish to get into office.

"The gentleman from Connecticut noticed this reproach: but as it appeared to be levelled chiefly at leading citizens in Massachusetts, I feel it to be my duty further to remark, that of all the citizens of the United States, none stand more aloof from, none more detest the character of demagogues, than those to whom the gen-

tleman referred. I know those men who reprobate the embargo, and who, in conversation, and in newspapers, express their sentiments about it, or patronize those who do. *They* are not seeking for offices; many of them could not be persuaded to accept the best office in a president's gift; but to save their country from the effects of measures, in their view, alike ruinous and disgraceful. They are men, sir, whose age, whose experience, whose knowledge, whose wisdom, whose virtue, place them in the first rank of citizens. They are men, sir, ten of whom, had they been in Sodom, would have saved that city from destruction. Among them was the immortal AMES, than whom a purer spirit never left the earth. He wrote while he had strength to hold a pen. He died on the anniversary morning of the nation's birth-day—and this was among his last prayers; O! Save my country!

"Gentlemen have said much about insurrection and rebellion; and, in language not very conciliatory, pointed all their allusions to the people of New England. Other rulers pronounced them rebels, more than thirty years ago: while many then unborn now wish to cover themselves with their mantle, and to share the honors of the patriots of seventeen hundred and seventy six.

"But why should gentlemen be surprized that great *discontents* prevail in that country; and that the legislatures, with a deliberation and solemnity which should command attention, have pronounced their opinions of the embargo? Gentlemen will recollect that *there* the revolution began, of which Boston was the cradle. And if they will turn to the declaration of independence, they will find one of the reasons for the colonies' separating themselves from Great Britain, and renouncing the government of the king, was, their enacting laws "FOR CUTTING OFF OUR TRADE WITH ALL PARTS OF THE WORLD."

"Mr. president, in a public document on our tables, we are told, that 'after a period of twenty-five years of peace, hardly interrupted by transient hostilities, and of prosperity unparalleled in the history of nations, the United States are for the first time, since the treaty which terminated the revolutionary war, placed in a situation equally difficult, critical, and dangerous.'

"That our country has enjoyed such unexampled prosperity, I readily agree: but the *present* is not the *first time* that these states have been placed in a *difficult*, *critical*, and *dangerous* situation.

"The gentleman from Connecticut yesterday noticed the most difficult crisis. In 1793, it required all the firmness and immense popularity of president Washington, to stem the torrent of popular delusion, that was hurrying the United States into the vortex of the French revolution.

"In 1794, the same steadiness, the same undeviating pursuit of the public welfare, in spite of popular clamor and formal opposition, were necessary to institute a mission to Great Britain, to negotiate and settle with that government questions of the highest moment to these states, and which, if they remained much longer unsettled, might

endanger the pence of the nation. That negociation, committed to the conduct of a statesman, than whom our country has produced not one more firm, more wise, or more upright, was, by his candour, ability, and decision, brought to a happy conclusion, in fewer *months* than some more modern negotiations have occupied *years*, without being brought to any conclusion; unless their utter *failure* may be called a *conclusion*.

"In 1795, the United States were agitated to their centre, by the opposition to the British treaty. Artful and aspiring demagogues seized upon the known prejudices of the people in regard to the two great contending nations; and exerting all their faculties to keep up the popular delusion, hoped that, by the loud and extended clamour, the President would be deterred from ratifying the treaty which Mr. Jay had so happily concluded. Here again were displayed the firmness and patriotism of Washington. Always determined to pursue the true interests of the people, although at the hazard of his popularity, he ratified the treaty. Here, it was presumed, all opposition would cease. But it again appeared, and with a more formidable aspect, in the national legislature. But I will not dwell upon it. The treaty was finally carried into execution. It had, however, one more enemy to encounter.

"Revolutionary France, wishing to involve us in a war with Great Britain, which this treaty (merely of amity and commerce) had prevented, *pretended* that it was equivalent to a treaty of *alliance* with Great Britain. And seizing on this pretence, at once to vent her resentment, and gratify the rapacity of her rulers with the plunder of our citizens, she let loose her cruizers upon our commerce.

"We urged the obligations of treaties, violated by these captures. She answered, *that she found only a real disadvantage in those obligations!* and continued her depredations. Repeated missions of respectable ministers to Paris endeavoured to propitiate her rulers, and prevail on them to put a stop to such enormities. But they were deaf to the voice of justice. Then it was that our government authorized an armed commerce, and equipped a small but gallant navy for its further protection; and made other defensive preparations, such as have been stated by the gentleman from Connecticut.

"If, Sir, our country is now placed in a situation more 'difficult, critical, and dangerous,' than at any of the periods to which I have adverted (though I am very far from adopting that opinion), where shall we look for the cause? If in 1794, when England had powerful associates in her war with France, and the latter had been comparatively but little extended beyond her natural limits; the United States, with perhaps two-thirds of her present population, and less than half her present revenue, were able to induce England to accede to their just demands, and to close all differences by an advantageous treaty; how has it happened that the present administration, with all the accession of power from an increased population, and a more than doubled revenue; when, too, gigantic France wielded the force and the resources of continental Europe; and

England, single-handed, was left to meet a world in arms; how has it happened, that with these superior advantages and more powerful means, all the negotiations of the present administration with England (one excepted of local rather than general application, and which I need not explain) have failed? Had they been conducted with equal candour, ability, and dignity, must they not have produced as early, and at least as advantageous results? Was this a cause of their failure, *that points of questionable right*, because not settled by the universally acknowledged law of nations, *and therefore of doubtful, or* hopeless *attainment, were pertinaciously insisted on?*

"Mr. President—To find a remedy for evils, as well in the body politic as in the natural body, it is necessary to investigate their causes.

"Nearly eight years have elapsed since we were told, by the highest authority in the nation, that under the auspices of the federal government, the United States were then 'in the full tide of successful experiment.' And the report on our tables, to which I have before alluded, declares, in grave and solemn language, that during a period of five-and-twenty years, which brings us down to the embargo, the United States have enjoyed a 'prosperity unexampled in the history of nations.' Yet during the whole of this period of unequalled prosperity, *arising from the active pursuits of commerce and agriculture, each giving life and vigour to the other*, that commerce has been exposed to the aggressions of the belligerent nations. For those of Great Britain, up to near the close of 1794, compensation was made, pursuant to the provisions of Mr. Jay's treaty. For the like aggressions by Spain, the like indemnity was given by virtue of the treaty with that power, concluded in October 1795. For French spoliations during the whole period of her revolutionary war, (spoliations which have been estimated at not less than millions of dollars) we have received *nothing!* Nor have we obtained any reimbursements from Spain for the spoliations committed by her cruizers, *after she became the ally of France.*

"Captures and condemnations, however more or less extended, have never ceased; notwithstanding all which, and the continued impressment of seamen from our merchant vessels, the same unexampled prosperity has attended us; until suddenly, and to the astonishment of the nation, this flowing tide of successful commerce and agriculture, was stopped by that fatal measure, the embargo. The shock was aggravated by the concealment of its real cause. Sir, I hazard nothing in asserting, that to this day, that cause has not been satisfactorily declared. Allow me time to justify this assertion. I will bring together facts and circumstances, and then gentlemen will judge whether my conclusion be erroneous or just.

"On the 14th of December 1807, the dispatches brought by the Revenge, from our Minister in Paris, were delivered to the Secretary of State. On her arrival at New York, reports brought by her stated, that the French emperor had declared *that there should be*

no neutrals. The sources of information, and the *character* of the *emperor*, rendered those reports worthy of credit; and though afterwards publicly and stoutly denied, they were believed; and no gentleman here will now be inclined to doubt the fact. These reports, and the mystery which surrounded the recommended embargo, naturally excited suspicions and alarms.

"Of the French papers supposed to be brought by the Revenge, none were communicated to Congress, save a letter dated September 24, 1807, from General Armstrong to M. de Champagny, and his answer of the 7th of October, relative to the Berlin decree, and a letter from Regnier, Minister of Justice, to Champagny, giving the Emperor's interpretation of that decree. These three papers, with a newspaper copy of a proclamation of the King of Great Britain, issued in the same October, were all the papers communicated by the President to Congress, as the grounds on which he recommended the embargo. *These papers*, he said, 'shewed the *great* and *increasing* dangers with which our vessels, our seamen, and merchandise were threatened on the high seas and elsewhere, from the belligerent powers of Europe.'

"As to the proclamation of the King of Great Britain, requiring the return of his subjects, and particularly the seamen, from foreign countries, it was no more than every government has a right to issue, and commonly does issue, in time of war. This proclamation contained no evidence of *increasing* danger to 'our seamen;' on the contrary, if I mistake not (for I have not the proclamation by me) there was a solemn, public injunction to his naval officers to conduct impressments with increased caution and care. So that impressments would probably rather be diminished than increased.

"Let us now examine the three other papers, all of which as I have noticed, and as gentlemen remember, related to the decree of November 21, 1806. This decree was issued at Berlin, by the French Emperor, at the moment when, inflated with more than ordinary arrogance and pride, he was sitting in that capital of the Prussian monarchy, just then subverted by his arms.

"The first article declared all the British Isles in a state of blockade. This, according to its terms, subjected to capture and condemnation all neutral vessels bound to and from British ports: but it seems to have been held in a state of suspense. But another article, declaring 'all merchandise belonging to England, or coming from its manufactories and colonies (although belonging to neutrals) to be lawful prize,' was to be carried into execution. Such was the decision of the Emperor, as stated by his Minister of Justice on the 18th of September, 1807, in his letter to Champagny. This decision coming to the knowledge of General Armstrong, he, on the 24th of September, wrote to M. Champagny, and asked 'whether it was the 'Emperor's intention to infract the obligations of the treaty subsisting between the United States and the French empire.' Mr. Champagny in his answer of the 7th of October, inclosing the letter of the 'Minister of Justice, with wonderful assurance, tells General Arm-

strong, that it was easy to reconcile the execution of the decree with the observance of treaties! although nothing was more obvious, (as Mr. Madison on the 8th of February last, wrote to General Armstrong) than that it violated as well the positive stipulations of our treaty with France, as the incontestable principles of public law.

"In the European ports, under the Emperor's controul, and even in neutral ports, the decree was rigorously executed. And although it is said there was no formal decision in the French council of prizes, condemning American property, under the decree, till the 16th of October 1807; yet Mr. Madison states, as early as the 22d of May, 1807, [in his letter of that date to General Armstrong] that 'there were proofs that the French West India privateers had, *under colour of the edict* [the Berlin decree,] committed depredations' on our commerce. And moreover, that Spain 'avowedly pursuing the example and the views of the French Emperor,' had issued a similar decree, and even in broader terms, which, 'if not speedily recalled or corrected, would doubtless extend the scene of spoliations *already begun in that quarter.*'

"Such were the French papers in this case. And now let us see the amount of 'the GREAT and INCREASING dangers which threatened our vessels, our seamen, and merchandise.'

"In the letter of February 8, 1808, from Mr. Madison to General Armstrong, speaking of the Berlin decree, and the Emperor's decision thereon, Mr. Madison says, "The conduct of the French government, in giving this extended operation to its decree, and indeed in issuing one with such an apparent or doubtful import, against the rights of the sea, is the more extraordinary, inasmuch as the *inability* to enforce it on that element, exhibited the measure in the light of an '*empty menace!*' And in his letter of the 25th of March 1808, to Mr. Erskine, Mr. Madison, speaking of the same decree, says, that France was *without the means to carry it into effect against the rights and obligations of a neutral nation.*

"Thus then we see the President's '*great* and *increasing* dangers with which our vessels, our seamen, and merchandise were threatened on the high seas and elsewhere,' from the French decree, and its extended operation, rested on what he, through his Secretary, Mr. Madison, has since pronounced an 'empty menace,' a project 'which France had not the means to carry into effect!'

"Shall I be told, Mr. President, of the British orders of council? and that *they* were comprehended in the President's view of the great and increasing dangers to which our commerce was exposed? If that were the fact, was it not his duty to give such information of them as he possessed, to the senate? He gave none. I know that those orders were *afterwards* pressed into his service to justify the measure; and still later it has been confidently said 'that those orders stood in front of the real causes of the embargo:' and yet they were invisible to the senate. What! the *great*, the *operative* cause of the embargo, 'before which all other motives sunk into insignificance,' not seen, not known to the senate? Not

glanced at by the President in his message, nor intimated to any of the members who were honoured with his confidence, and by them to the senate?

"But from reasoning I will recur to written proofs, furnished by the President himself, and now on our tables.

"In Mr. Madison's letter to Mr. Pinkney, the President's minister in London, dated December 23, 1807, the next day after the act laying an embargo was passed; and this after it had undergone three days of earnest opposition in the house of representatives—during which it behoved the father of the measure, and his friends, to furnish every possible argument to silence opposition, and to satisfy the nation of its expediency and necessity—after all this, Mr. Madison, in that letter, tells Mr. Pinkney, that 'the *policy* and the *causes* of the measure are explained in the message itself.' The contents of the message (comprehending the papers it referred to) I have already stated; and the statement demonstrates, that *they* were *not* the *causes* or *motives* of the embargo: for an empty 'menace,' *a decree without the means of carrying it into effect*, could be no *cause*, no *motive* for a measure, whose *avowed* object was 'to save our vessels, our seamen, and merchandise from GREAT and INCREASING DANGERS.'

"Sir, let all the documents laid on our tables by the president be examined, and you will not find one in which he hazards the assertion, that the British orders of November 11th were known to him at the time he recommended the embargo, or that an expectation of them determined his recommendation. It was not until the second of February, when they had been officially communicated by the British minister, that he offered them to congress 'as a *farther* proof of the increasing dangers to our navigation and commerce, which led to the provident measure of the act laying an embargo.' And Mr. Madison, in his letter to Mr. Pinkney, of Feb. 19, 1808, cautiously avoids ascribing the *origin* of the embargo to the British orders; though, he says, the probability of such decrees was among the considerations which 'enforced' the measure; the language of the British gazettes, with other indications, having (he said) left little doubt that such orders were 'meditated.' And he adds, that 'the appearance of these decrees, (meaning the British orders) had much effect in reconciling all descriptions among us to the embargo.'

"But I must notice the change of language in Mr. Madison's last letter. In that of December 23d to Mr. Pinkney, he says, 'the *policy* and the *causes* of the embargo are explained in the President's message.' But in his letter of February 19th, he says, 'my last (that of December 23d) inclosed a copy of the act of embargo, and explained the *policy* of the measure;' leaving out 'causes,' and introducing the *unknown British orders* as among the considerations which *enforced* it.

"The President, too, in his answer to the Boston petition for suspending the embargo, says, *not* that the British orders were *known* to

exist at the time when the embargo was laid, but only that *they were in existence* at the date of the law; from which the unwary reader might suppose that they were *known to exist* at that date.

"From all these considerations, it appears to be demonstrated, that the British orders in council of November 11th, 1807, were not known, and that the newspaper rumours concerning them never entered into the views of the President and Congress, as a motive for laying the embargo. And here the well known maxim applies, *de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est lex.* Although the British orders *were in existence*, yet as they were *not known to exist*, they were, as to the embargo, non-entities.

"The conclusions resulting from the facts and circumstances which I have collected and compared, are serious and alarming. They demonstrate, that the representation in the President's message recommending the embargo, was delusive, calculated to lead congress into the belief that the situation of the United States, in relation to France and England, was extremely perilous, requiring the instant adoption of the measure recommended. And as congress did adopt it, enacting the law recommended, it must be presumed that they believed an embargo was necessary to preserve our vessels, our seamen, and merchandise, from *great* and *increasing* dangers, with which the message stated that they were threatened.

"It also follows, as no subsequent disclosure has been made of other dangers known at the time the message was communicated, *that the* real cause *or* motive *for the embargo has been, and yet is, veiled from the eye of congress and the nation.*

"M. Champagny's letter of October 7, (one of the papers communicated with the President's message) requires examination. But I should first remark, that during the years 1806 and 1807, in order to reduce England, *by destroying her commerce*, the French Emperor, in execution of, and in the spirit of his Berlin decree, ordered all English merchandize to be seized and confiscated, in every place on the European continent, enemy or neutral, occupied, or which should be occupied, by the French armies. For this purpose, and as one instance among many, his troops took possession of the city of Hamburgh (a city with which American merchants carried on a large and valuable commerce, and which as *neutral* was entitled to the same exemption from hostile violence as the territory of the United States) and by the emperor's orders, Bourrienne, his accredited minister to that free city, addressed a note to its senate, in which, having stated that every person who traded on the continent in English merchandize, seconded the views of England, and ought to be considered as her accomplice; and that a great portion of the inhabitants of Hamburgh were in that predicament, and notoriously attached to England; the Emperor caused possession to be taken of their city, and his Berlin decree to be carried into rigorous execution. Accordingly, that minister, in obedience to the emperor's orders, among other outrages, declared 'All English merchandizes that may be found in the city, in the harbour, or

on the territory of Hamburgh, *no matter to whom they belong*, shall be confiscated.' This was done so early as the 24th of November, 1806, only three days after the Berlin decree was issued.

"With equal atrocity, the Emperor caused to be seized and sequestered the vessels and cargoes of neutrals which were brought into, or voluntarily resorted to the ports of France for purposes of lawful trade. And *we know* from a source which will not be questioned, that their liberation was hopeless; *because they were worth eighteen or twenty millions of dollars.*

"Of the vast property thus plundered, a large portion belongs to citizens of the United States. On the 15th of January last, the Emperor's minister Champagny, wrote to our minister, General Armstrong, that their property would remain sequestered until a decision should be had thereon; and this decision depended *on our associating* or *refusing to associate ourselves with him and his allied states in their war with Great Britain.* Indeed the Emperor was willing to save us the trouble of considering and deciding for ourselves: he declared war for us. 'War exists then in fact between England and the United States,' are the words of Champagny, in the letter just mentioned! What measures ought to be kept with such a power? While we are yet independent, he undertakes to prescribe the line of conduct we shall observe, on pain of confiscation of all the property of our innocent and unsuspecting merchants within his grasp! And this monstrous outrage upon our honour and independence, the Secretary of State, with very exemplary meekness, says, 'had the *air*, at least, of an assumed authority!'*

"Where his armies did not penetrate and plunder, the French Emperor sent to the several powers on the continent, whether emperors, kings, or petty states, requiring (or which from him was equivalent to a command, *inviting*) them *to shut their ports against the commerce of England:* and, Sweden excepted (between whom and the French armies lay a narrow sea guarded by Swedish and British ships) all obeyed. Even the emperor of Austria, though at peace with England, shut against her his two or three little ports at the head of the Adriatic sea.

"The Prince Regent of Portugal, whose country for more than a century had lived in friendship with England, was the last to obey. But though he shut his ports, national faith and gratitude towards his friends, forbade his arresting Englishmen and English merchandize. By shutting his ports he hoped to appease the Emperor, and save his kingdom. But his fate had been determined; although Portugal had for many years been paying a heavy tribute to France, and been, moreover, anxious to observe the duties of a neutral nation. To save himself and family from disgrace and bondage, the Prince quitted his kingdom, finding an asylum in his American dominions.

---

* Mr. Madison's Letter of May 2d, 1808, to General Armstrong.

"Thus we have seen the French Emperor not only shutting his own ports and those of his allies, but even those of neutral states, against British commerce; and seizing and confiscating the merchandize proceeding from England and her colonies, although belonging to neutrals, and on neutral territories; and that this unexampled scene of devastation commenced within four days after the Berlin decree was issued.

"It was after she had witnessed all these atrocities, and seen the deadly weapon aimed at her vitals, that England issued her retaliating orders of November 11th, 1807.

"I now recur to Mr. Champagny's letter of October 7, to general Armstrong, in answer to his inquiry, 'whether (in executing the Berlin decree) it was His Majesty's intention to infract the obligations of the treaty now subsisting between the United States and the French empire?' The answer to which has been already recited.

"Allow me to repeat, that this letter of Champagny was one of the four papers communicated by the president with his message recommending the embargo, and one of the two which, after being read, was not then suffered to remain on the files of the senate, but was returned to the president, together with general Armstrong's letter to which it was an answer, agreeably to his request. Subsequent events drew it from the cabinet. Gentlemen will also recollect, that the concluding paragraph of the president's message, in which he desired a return of those two letters, was ordered by the senate to be omitted; so that no evidence of the existence of those letters could appear on the senate's journal, or in the printed copy. In this letter of Champagny, the views of the French emperor were but too clearly indicated. To render his degree of blockade 'more effectual' (that is in destroying the commerce of England) 'its execution must be complete.' But as it could not be complete while the vessels of the United States (then with those of England carrying on, almost exclusively, the commerce of the world) continued their extensive trade with England; we were, in language sufficiently intelligible, invited to fall into the imperial ranks, with the maritime powers of Europe, whom the French emperor had marshalled against England, and 'to unite in support of the same cause;' that is, to destroy the commerce of England. But the people of the United States would have been shocked at an open proposition to shut their ports against the English commerce, at the command, or invitation of the French emperor; they would not have endured it. The measure could be accomplished only by an EMBARGO, and that wrapped up in the mystery which I have endeavoured to unfold.

"This letter of Champagny must have arrived in the Revenge; and general Armstrong's dispatches by her, reached Washington, as Mr. Madison informs us, on the 14th of December; and on the 18th the embargo was proposed and recommended! Four days gave little enough time to digest and mature SUCH A PLAN!

"These, sir, are my views of the origin of the embargo; the result of a careful, and I trust, an impartial investigation. The material facts are on record. Of my reasonings and conclusions gentlemen will judge. If these be correct, the course to be pursued must be obvious. The *nation's honour* is compatible with the repeal of the embargo. The welfare of our country is not to be sacrificed to the views or feelings of those who have brought it into its present situation.

"Let then, the resolution before us be adopted, and the embargo removed. As the British orders in council were not the *cause* of the embargo, the *honour* of the United States is not pledged for their *previous repeal.*"

MISCELLANIES.

Copy of a Letter to the Rev. Dr. Mansel, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, on the Subject of the Curate's Bill.

(Concluded from page 440.)

"WE see here that a competent and sufficient salary for the minister who is to supply the cure from which the pluralist is most absent, is to be limited and allotted by the proper ordinary at his discretion, or by the archbishop, in case the diocesan shall not take due care therein.

"With respect to the manner in which the non-resident minister is to provide for the performance of his duties in the person of his curate, we have seen that residence most clearly is one of those duties; and therefore, if he does not reside himself, he must provide one, if the means of his living will afford it, who shall reside in his place, and who shall also be competently provided with the means of discharging all the other duties connected with that residence, and growing out of it; one who shall reside in the rectorial house, so as to insure the house in a competent state of reparation, for the benefit of the successor, and not leave him to resort to a suit for dilapidations, against perhaps insolvent representatives, for the means of repairing it.

"The duty of hospitality, in which I mean all those modes of charity which, in an extended sense, the word hospitality includes: the duty also of decent and respectable appearance amongst the parishioners, so as to uphold the character of the minister, and prevent it from falling through meanness and indigence into contempt; the duty of maintaining a character, and setting an example which may illustrate, enforce, and grace the doctrines and the principles which he preaches; all these and many more must be admitted to form important parts of the duty, which the rector, if he does not perform himself, should provide a curate to perform in his stead. I deny confidently that his mere duty is to read prayers, to preach a sermon,

to christen, to marry, and to bury. I deny, in short, that his duty when it is properly understood, is of such a nature, that his *quantum meruit* may be determined, by the low price at which the necessities perhaps of an indigent and half-starving curate may be prevailed upon to undertake them. If the duties to which I have referred are some of those which it is incumbent on the rector either to perform himself, or to provide for the performance of, I think it must be admitted that the trouble and labour of the cure constitute no just criterion upon which to estimate the proper amount of the salary; that the terms on which the rector can prevail upon a man to discharge these duties, are not mere matters of private contract between the rector and his curate; that the curate is not the true and only person to put the proper estimate on the value of his own labour; and that, though he should be contented, that the public may still have right to complain and interpose. And what a principle would it be to establish? what dreadful consequences might it not lead to in the church? If this was the authorized criterion and standard which the legislature should be supposed to have set up, or to have sanctioned, by which to try and measure the sufficiency of the curate's salary, namely, the curate's consent to accept it, as the value which he puts upon his own labour. If this were to be the authorized criterion, I should still trust indeed, and confidently, that in far the greater proportion of instances principle would interfere to prevent the beneficed incumbents from contenting themselves with referring to such a standard. I will not therefore say what the consequences *must* or *would be*, but I must be at liberty to contend that the fair, logical, natural deduction, and consequence from such a principle once admitted, would be this, that the incumbent might justifiably and properly, acting too under the sanction of the legislature, hunt out the least accomplished, the least learned, the most indigent and the most unqualified man whom he could find, and who could barely pass the bishop's examination, because with him unquestionably he could drive the best bargain, and make his own sinecure the most profitable.

If then there are other duties, besides those of reading the services of the church, and preaching a sermon, (begging to be understood, however, that I don't mean to undervalue those duties of reading and preaching, for I feel and know their immense value and importance); if there are other duties, which, if not equally valuable, when taken by themselves, yet when united with those of reading and preaching, increase the sum of value in the whole, in a tenfold proportion; and if those duties are, some of them, such as I have enumerated, what can be more reasonable than that the legislature should provide, in the case of non-resident incumbents, that the incumbent who has a duty of residence to perform, or to supply, and who has furnished to him, out of the income of his living, ample means for maintaining that residence in a manner useful to all his parishioners, and particularly to the poorer sort of them, ample means for holding a respectable and distinguished station amongst some of the higher order of his

parishioners, a station reflecting credit upon the clerical character, and upholding the interests of religion, that such an incumbent should be compelled according to his means, to provide a substitute, who can perform all these various duties for him in some degree proportionate to the manner in which he might perform them himself?

"The principle in political economy which is so wise, viz. that things should be permitted to find their own level: that the price of labour should be left to be settled between the labourer and his master, the merchant and his clerk, the manufacturer and his journeymen, is wholly inapplicable to such a subject as this; is wholly inapplicable to any subject where true policy requires that some object, connected with, or arising out of that subject, should be protected, to which it is not the personal interest of the contracting parties to attend. The curate's interest undoubtedly is to get as large a compensation as he can for his labour, whereby to support his family and himself; but it is his interest, if he cannot get what would be sufficient for his decent maintenance, to get what he can; and to be content with less than enough, rather than with none at all. The rector's interest (I must be understood to mean his interest as unconnected with his duty, and in the sense in which that word applies in reference to the principle of political economy which I am canvassing), such interest, such pecuniary interest of the rector looks only to getting the duty performed at as little expence to himself as he can. But true policy, and the interest of the public, require that it should be done in such a manner as that the reverence and respect due to the character of the officiating minister of the church may be supported, and the most beneficial effect may be produced by the proper performance of his duties. This interest therefore of the public it is, which, unless the law interferes by its regulations to protect, may possibly be neglected altogether, and would certainly be neglected, in any case where the rector should be so unprincipled as to conduct himself only upon these mercantile, economical considerations which the argument I am now combating supposes might be satisfactorily relied on.

But it is said, that although the *mere* quantum of preaching and praying, the mere amount of parochial duty of this description should not be the *sole* criterion by which the salary of the curate should be determined, yet that it should be attended to in some degree. And therefore, supposing the case of two livings, each of them of one thousand three hundred pounds per annum, and which, according to my principle, would each afford two hundred and fifty pounds per annum to a curate, it is contended that it would be quite absurd, if there were only two or three houses, and little or no duty to be performed upon one, and a greater population, with very heavy duty in the other, that the curate in each should be paid alike. Now, I admit that if the non-resident rector, upon the parish most burthened with duty, should feel this absurdity, he would act very properly and very meritoriously, if he corrected it by making a still larger allowance to his curate, who is burthened

with this greater duty; but any thing beyond one fifth I would leave entirely to himself. By securing the two hundred and fifty pounds per annum I should hope that the state secured a competency to support the curate in decent and respectable circumstances. But I do not think much less than that sum does secure to him, in these times, any such competency. Wherever, therefore, any such competency can be obtained out of the income of the living, leaving behind it four-fifths of the whole for the incumbent who does nothing, I think it ought to be obtained; and, *however little* duty the resident curate may, in the most easy parish, have to perform, it will always be more than the *nothing* which the non-resident rector performs. And let the advocates for such non-resident rectors be cautious how they too strongly push the argument upon the *quantum meruit;* for, should it be thought that the curate, who performs *little* duty, does not deserve two hundred and fifty pounds per annum; it will be hardly thought that the rector, who performs *none*, and who yet receives nine hundred and fifty per annum, is just the person who should urge that argument.

My principle is this, I think two hundred and fifty pounds per annum in no possible instance is too much. I wish, with all my heart, that it could prevail universally; I have no difficulty in saying, that I wish there was not a parish in the kingdom without a resident officiating minister with a salary of at least two hundred and fifty pounds per annum; I believe that such a improvement in the state of church property would be the greatest blessing that could be conferred upon the religion, the morals, the industry, the happiness, and all the best interests of the people.

In saying this I do not mean that I would act upon an equalizing principle, levelling the opulence of the more wealthy to that standard, but upon the principle of raising the more indigent up to it. But however desirable such an alteration and improvement might be, the revenue of the church will not bear it; and the state, I fear, burthened as it is with expence, could but ill afford, at this time, to make any such provision for it. If any man, however, agrees with me in this opinion, he will certainly allow that where the provision of the particular church is ample, where the means provided by law and by the state are abundant for the purpose, and such as to leave a very large income in proportion for the non-resident incumbent, there, no justifiable reason can be urged against supplying it. There is something so unseemly to my mind, in any man thus endeavouring to run away with these large salaries, and ecclesiastical incomes, without discharging their duties himself, considering what those duties are, and at the same time, withholding the means by which his substitute may decently and respectably perform them, that I will not trust myself with saying what I think of it.

"But it has been argued, that, if two hundred and fifty pounds per annum is necessary and proper for the curate's salary, in any parish in which the burthen of duty is extremely small, it must be necessary in every parish; and, therefore, the law should require,

that no curate should be appointed without a salary of two hundred and fifty pounds per annum. It is obvious that the effect of such a regulation would be, to compel the owners of small benefices to perform their duties themselves, to deprive them of the benefit and licence of non-residence altogether, and, as to pluralities, to prevent their existence altogether as connected with small livings.

"This undoubtedly would be to introduce an alteration in the state of the church property, infinitely greater than what my proposal aims at. But, to be consistent with myself, I must admit that I have no disposition to quarrel with the principle of this argument; and if such an alteration could be accompanied with the improvement in the state of church property, which I have alluded to above, namely, that of raising the incomes of every living and benefice in the country to the amount of two hundred and fifty pounds at least; I certainly should think that it might be advisable to require, under such circumstances, that no incumbent, who is not resident, should appoint a curate with a smaller salary. A law to that effect, however, would oblige the incumbents on such smaller livings either to reside themselves, or give up the whole advantage of their benefices.

"But, while the state of ecclesiastical property remains as it is, and while the arguments for the necessity of pluralities, or at least in favour of them, arising from the insufficient provision of the clergy, continue to appear so plausible as they do at present, a law indispensably requiring, in all cases, so large a salary to curates, is evidently inapplicable. And, it is not uncandid to add, that it must be known and felt to be so by those who urge it, and that it is therefore that they urge it. But can it, to any cool and impartial mind, appear to be a reasonable way of dealing with the practicable improvement which my measure proposes, to point out a still greater improvement, to which my own principle would, I admit, fairly extend, but which greater improvement is wholly and obviously unattainable; and then to say, that, if I cannot accomplish such greater improvement, if I cannot carry my own principle to its perfection, I ought not to attempt to act upon it at all, nor carry it to the extent to which it may be carried? It is in other words to say, if you cannot reach perfection, you should not strive at improvemnet; this, whatever it may be, certainly is not practical wisdom. My more moderated view aims at no more than this; I conceive £ 250 per annum to be in no case too large an income for a resident officiating minister of the church of England. Where then such an income can be had for the resident minister, leaving still behind a large proportion of surplus for the incumbent, I think it ought to be had. But where the benefice can by no means afford it, as long as pluralities, as long as non-residence are allowed, so long I conceive we must be contented, in inferior livings, to take less, and even much less. But then, as the only reason for being contented to take that less is the inferior value of the benefice, which cannot afford what we would prefer, the

amount of salary which even there is required, should be regulated in a given proportion to that value. And when the manner in which the whole of our ecclesiastical establishment is paid is taken into consideration, such a distinction in the salary of the curates will, I think, be found in perfect conformity to the general principle which pervades the whole establishment. It is, in all its other branches, paid unequally. The character of the whole ecclesiastical body, their station and dignity, their rank and estimation in society, as far as depends upon the appearance which property enables its members to assume, is supported, in a great degree, upon that high level which they hold, by a sort of average, if I may so express myself, which is made up of the different degrees of opulence which belongs to different orders, and which belongs also to the different individuals in the same orders. The rank, the dignity, the opulence of the bishops, and the more opulent clergy, reflect a certain degree of dignity and respectability to the whole body of which they are members. In the different classes the same observation applies. The respectability and dignity of the episcopal character, in those instances where the incomes of the bishops are extremely low, is, however, upheld by that station which the more opulent of the order are now enabled to maintain. So it is with respect to the order of rectors, whose incomes are so unequal. Why then should not the same principle be usefully extended to the class of curates, to uphold that class from the contempt which might, and, I fear, in many cases, does fall on it; and, through the class, on the whole of religion, or at least the whole of the church, by the indigence under which some of them labour? If, from the poverty of some livings, you must be content to have curacies served for fifteen pounds per annum, because the livings themselves are worth no more: on terms, therefore, which renders it absolutely necessary for curates, in order to obtain a possible maintenance, to do the duties of distant, parishes; if you must be content to see and put up with the appearance of indigence, the slovenliness of hurry, and all the indecencies which are connected with such circumstances, in those cases, where the legal provision will afford no better means of providing for the discharge of the duty, is it not of importance that the general character of the body of curates, (a most useful, a most deserving, a most interesting body of men,) should, if possible, be upheld from the contempt into which their circumstances might tend to plunge them, — to plunge the individuals first, and through them the whole order, — by the better, the more decent appearance, and more exalted and comfortable condition, which others, where the legal provision of the living does afford such means, may be enabled to support?

With respect to the discretion in the bishops which this measure would repose, it is, I imagine, quite clear, that if the measure is at any time to be adopted, the superintendence of its execution, and any discretion with which it is to be executed, must be reposed in the bishops. It can be reposed no where else consistently with the

known constitution and establishment of the church. The attempt to place it in lay hands, or indeed in any other hands but those of the bishops, would, I apprehend, be such a departure from all analogies which the ecclesiastical establishment presents to us, that it would be wholly inadmissible. Besides, it is not a new principle; the dispensation in the case of a plurality, which is already referred to, presents the same principle; and the statute of the 36 Geo. III. cap. 83. following the precedent of the 12 Ann. stat. 2. c. 12. refers itself for execution to the discretion of the bishop. It appears, therefore, that the regulation of the curate's salary by the bishop's discretion is no innovation; it has prevailed at all times by the canon law, and by statute for near a century. The 36 Geo. III. cap. 8. reciting the statute of Anne, begins thus: 'Whereas in and 'by a statute passed in the twelfth year of the reign of Queen 'Anne, it is enacted, that if any rector or vicar having cure of 'souls, should, after the 29th September 1714, nominate and pre-'sent any curate to the bishop or ordinary, to be licensed or ad-'mitted to serve the cure of such rector or vicar in his absence, the 'said bishop or ordinary, *having regard to the greatness of the cure*, 'and the value of the ecclesiastical benefices of such rector or vicar, 'should, on or before the granting such licence, appoint by writing 'under his hand and seal a sufficient certain stipend or allowance, 'not exceeding 50*l.* per annum, nor less than 20*l.* per annum, to be 'paid or answered at such times as he should think fit, by such rec-'tor or vicar, to such curate for his support and maintenance; and 'if it should appear to the bishop or ordinary, upon complaint or 'otherwise, that any curate of such rector or vicar, licensed or ad-'mitted before the 29th September 1714, had not a sufficient main-'tenance, it should be lawful for the said bishop or ordinary to ap-'point him a certain stipend or allowance in like manner as before 'mentioned; and in case any difference shall arise between any rec-'tor or vicar and his curate, touching such stipend or allowance, 'or the payment thereof, the bishop or ordinary, on complaint to 'him made, should summarily hear and determine the same; and in 'case of neglect or refusal to pay such stipend or allowance, might 'sequester the profits of such benefice for and until the payment 'thereof: And whereas in many places the provision made in and by 'the said statute for the support and maintenance of such curate is 'now become insufficient,' &c.—It then proceeds with its enactment to enable the bishop to grant seventy-five pounds per annum (instead of 50) over and besides, on livings where the rector or vicar does not personally reside four months in the year at least, the use of the rectorial or vicarage house, &c. Here then, I trust, I have distinctly shewn that I am introducing no new principle, no innovation, but am only applying a known, an ancient and recognized principle, in the manner in which the altered circumstances of the times require.

It has indeed been said that my bill differs materially in principle from the acts to which I have just referred, because the bishop is in

those Acts, specially directed "to have regard to the "greatness of the Cure." But, in the first place, I answer, It is not only in the statute of Anne that these words occur; they are not repeated in the 36 Geo. III; and, if they were found in the above Acts, they could not, according to my view of the subject, have any place in this measure,—because the sum of two hundred and fifty pounds per annum, is in this measure assumed to be the minimum of salary which a Curate should enjoy, wherever the value of the Cure is sufficient to afford such an allowance. It is assumed that he should, in all cases, however trifling might be the amount of duty, have such sum secured to him, not merely as the price of remuneration for his labour, but as the means of decent maintenance. The greatness of the Cure therefore, might indeed, upon that principle, make a larger salary reasonable; but the smallness of it could never make a less salary proper, where one to that amount could be procured.

With regard, however, to the discretion of the Bishops, I will fairly own, that I would much rather have made it imperative upon them, in all cases, to grant the one-fifth of the income of the Benefice (not exceeding 250 *l.*) than have left them any discretion upon this point at all: I think it would have been more to their own ease, as well as more to the benefit of the Church in all its ranks, and in all its interests. But, whatever objection there may be to this discretionary power, I feel confident that it is an objection which should be urged, as it will certainly be felt more by the Curates than by the Rectors; for it is evident that this power can only operate in diminishing the salary below the allowance which the law prescribes, and never in extending it. It cannot, therefore, be oppressively exercised as against the Rector; and to judge from the sparing way in which, if I am not misinformed, most of the Bishops exercise the discretionary power already vested in them under the 36th of Geo. III., the fear is, that the Curates will have much more reason to complain than the Rectors that any such discretion continues to exist. But, notwithstanding this impression, I could not venture to omit it; for much as this discretion may now be objected to, I am persuaded, if it had not been introduced, that the Bill would, on that account, have had to encounter a much greater opposition; and I have therefore resorted to it, not as what I thought most preferable, but what I thought most attainable.

As to the charge, That the measure originates in a dark and mysterious design of hostility against the Establishment—that it aims at destroying the independence and dignity of the Ecclesiastical Character,—and at driving from the profession all men of independent and liberal minds,—it really appears to me to be so extravagant as not to deserve a serious answer. If, indeed, it does originate in

such a design, it must be confessed that it is very dark, and very mysterious, and very well disguised; at least, it far surpasses any power of mine to understand or detect it. Its hostility against the Establishment is manifested by its deference to Episcopal Authority, which, according to the opponents arguments, it enlarges and confirms. It seeks to destroy the independence and dignity of the Ecclesistical Character, by endeavouring to rescue the officiating Ministers throughout the country from indigence and contempt; — and it aims at driving every man of liberal mind from the profession, by requiring that the person, for instance, who receives an annual payment of 2000 *l.* for the performance of certain duties (which he neglects) shall be obliged to pay 250 *l.* to the Curate, who performs them in his stead, and shall be contented himself with the remaining 1,750 *l.* for doing nothing. The liberality of mind which will be revolted by such an obligation, may, I should conceive, be driven from the Church without any loss to that profession.

I have now gone through all the leading objections which I have heard urged against the Bill; there may be others of a minor nature, to some of the details of which I have not here adverted; but I do not believe there are any which are not, if they should really be felt as objections, capable of being obviated by such amendments as might be admitted, without any departure from the principle of the Bill itself; — and I cannot conclude without expressing a hope that, if any such occur to you, you will have the goodness to suggest them.

The application of this measure to Ireland, is reserved for a separate Bill.

I am,

my dear Sir,

very sincerely,

yours,

Sr. Percival.

MISCELLANIES.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION *AND DR. MILNER.*

WE have pledged ourselves to watch all the movements of this doughty Doctor of the Church of Rome vigilantly and closely; and if we suffer any thing of his to escape us, our readers must impute the omission to oversight and not to design. We know with what kind of a Champion we have entered the lists; we are aware that, with Gentlemen of his cloth and faith, we are to expect neither fairness, candour, nor quarter. All the arts of the Jesuits, we are persuaded, will be exerted against us, and no pains, labour, nor perseverance, will, we are sensible, be spared to subdue us.—We trust, however, that, among the honest and able members of the Establishment (and some such, thank Heaven, there still are, notwithstanding the desertion of my Lord of Norwich) we shall find active Coadjutors, who will draw their *pens* in the same cause for which their forefathers *bled* and *burnt*.

Dr. Milner, though he has attacked our strictures in the notable production of his *polite* Friend, *the member of the Ceremonies* to the party, and Jesuit like, has made us say what we never did say, yet has deemed it prudent to enter upon a similar Analysis of our Animadversions on the pretty miracle of Dr. Winifred, which would really have done honour to the middle ages. We shall now lay before our readers a Letter of the Doctor's, which appeared in the *Dublin Journal* in November last, and some Answers which it extorted from a Protestant writer, who has, with considerable ingenuity and acuteness, detected his falsities, exposed his misrepresentations, and chastised his presumption.

MR. EDITOR,

IT was not till within these four days that I met with your paper of Oct. 15th and 17th. Observing in these, and in some other periodical publications, the manner in which my name is introduced, for the purpose of aspersing some of the most distinguished and honourable characters in the United Parliament, as if they had pro-

posed a plan for a certain restricted interference of the Crown in the nomination of the Catholic Prelates of Ireland, without any warrant for this purpose; and that my sentiments on this subject, expressed on one occasion, are quoted in opposition to those which I have expressed on another occasion,—I think myself called upon to vindicate those personages, and to do justice to myself before the public; which, with your permission, I will attempt in your Paper. The Public will not be averse from hearing me upon a subject on which it has repeatedly called for information.

Some few days before the discussion took place in Parliament upon the Catholic Petition, I was summoned to wait upon some of the leading Members,—and was interrogated by them, in quality of Agent to the Catholics of Ireland, as to the mode of filling up vacancies in their Body,—and as to the means of obtaining an additional pledge, which, in the then existing state of Europe, was deemed requisite that none but men of the most approved loyalty and peaceable conduct should be chosen for this purpose. My answer, in the different communications I had upon this subject, was to the following effect:—That I had no specific instructions on this subject from my Constituents,—and that there was no time, previously to the approaching debate, for obtaining any instructions from Ireland:—That I knew full well the Catholic Bishop could not give to his Majesty,—nor he, as Head of the Established Church, receive, a Right of Patronage, or any other *positive power* in this concern, as this would be *an incontestable pledge and act of mutual Religious Communion*:—nevertheless, that I had very good reason to believe the Catholic Bishops of Ireland would not be averse, under *certain circumstances*, and as *part of a general arrangement*, from conceding to the Crown *a certain negative power*, or *veto*—such as would, in my opinion, afford the desired Pledge,—provided always that this power were limited within the bounds necessary for the safety, as well as for the independency of our Church,—and in such manner as to prevent the *negative power* from becoming a *positive power*, and from being otherwise abused, for the oppression, corruption, or detriment of our Religion.

Whoever duly weighs this statement, sees that our Parliamentary Advocates were warranted in the declarations which they made in Parliament, *to the extent and in the manner here set down*; and it is my duty thus publicly to avow the share which I took in the warrant under which they spoke of the presumed disposition of the Irish Prelates to make the desired concessions. On the other hand, he will see I did not hold out any, the most distant, prospect of these Prelates yielding to the Crown any degree of *ecclesiastical supremacy*, or *actual power*, *direct or indirect*, over the Catholic Church of Ireland. In short, he will acquit the Honourable and Noble Personages alluded to of the foul fraud imputed to them by their Political Adversaries; and he will acquit me also of the inconsistencies with which I have been charged in the Newspapers,

with respect to my declarations and writings on different occasions.

II. In a matter of so much importance to many respectable persons, as well as to myself, and which is likely to undergo much discussion at the approaching meeting of Parliament, I shall be readily excused by the Public for laying before it, distinctly and fully, the Plan which I endeavoured to give a general idea of to the Members of Parliament with whom I communicated, as being unexceptionable, in my own private opinion, and as being likely to meet with the approbation of the Catholic Bishops in Ireland. We cannot then, as I have before mentioned, admit of any *direct power* in the Crown over the appointment of our Bishops, or the other concerns of our religion,—because this would be to acknowledge the Royal Ecclesiastical Supremacy, which if we could reconcile to our consciences, we might spare our parliamentary friends an infinite deal of trouble, by taking the oath provided for this purpose. In fact, this would be a formal renunciation of the tenets of our religion. Nor can we conscientiously yield to the Crown an *efficient indirect power* in these matters, because this would be to abandon its safety; for who does not see that in such a state of things as the present, when the Minister has equivalently declared it to be his duty to do all the mischief he can to our religion; and his noble relative has pronounced that our hierarchy must necessarily be destroyed; and when the most violent enemy of our Church in existence has been appointed a Privy Counsellor, for the express purpose of regulating the concerns of religion—who, I say, does not see that if the Crown possessed an efficient, though indirect power, in the appointment of our Prelates, we should, on every vacancy, have the most heterodox or immoral ecclesiastic professing our communion, palmed upon us for the purpose of betraying or of disgracing us!—Still, in my opinion, a negative power or veto, under due restrictions, may be granted, sufficient to satisfy all the fair claims of the state; and which will not expose our Church to danger under the most hostile Ministers.

The mode of filling up the vacant Catholic Sees in Ireland is the following:—Upon the demise of a Bishop, the officiating Clergy, or the Chapter of the diocese, meet, and choose three Clergymen, *Dignus*, *Dignior*, and *Dignissimus*, whose names they send up by what is called a Postulation to the Metropolitan of the Province in which the Diocese is situated. Upon this he calls his surviving suffragan Bishops to meet him in Synod, where the postulation is either approved of or amended as they, in their wisdom, think best. Application is then made to the Chief Pastor of the Catholic Church, for those spiritual faculties in favour of the candidates most approved of; which we deem necessary for the continuation of a Divine Mission from the Apostles down to the Bishop elect. Now this mode of appointing Bishops, incontestably approaches nearer to that which prevailed in the Primitive Church during her

golden ages, than any other which has since been adopted in the different ages and countries of Christianity, as is well known to learned men, who are versed in the ancient canons and the writings of the Fathers, particularly of St. Cyprian; and as the unlearned may soon convince themselves by consulting the Ecclesiastical History of Fleury. In a word, it is impracticable in the existing circumstances to take from the Catholic Prelates of Ireland the actual power which they possess over the nonimation of their future colleagues. Nevertheless, loyal as they are in their principles and conduct, and bound as they are by their duty, their oaths, and their recent unanimous resolution in their Assembly of Sept. 14 and 15, "to adhere to their former rule of nominating no persons to the episcopal rank but men of the most approved loyalty and peaceable conduct," there is neither law nor reason (should a proper arrangement for this purpose be settled) against their taking information of the subject of the candidate's loyalty, and even binding themselves to take such information, from the quarter which is best qualified and authorized to pronounce upon this subject,—I mean his Majesty's Government, whether this Government be friendly or hostile to them. For example, Were I a Catholic Bishop or Metropolitan of Ireland, and were I deliberating about the merits of a certain candidate for episcopacy; as I would take information from his fellow-students concerning his talents and learning,—from his fellow-clergymen concerning his orthodoxy,—from his parishioners concerning his morals,—so I should have no difficulty of referring the question concerning his loyalty and civil principles to the King's representative. If, after a space of time to be fixed upon, suppose a fortnight or a month, for the purpose of making due enquiries, I were informed by the Secretary of the Castle that the result of them was unfavourable to the character of the candidate *Dignissimus*, as a subject or a citizen, I should expect that some discussion would take place, in order that a meritorious character might not be ruined by groundless calumny or malicious whispering. In case, however, Government persisted in its objections, I should then, after consulting with my brethren, and being authorized by them, present the name of the candidate *Dignior*. Should he also be rejected on the score of disloyalty, after some enquiry into the grounds of the specific charges against him, I should of course, with the same formalities, offer the name of the remaining candidate *Dignus*. In case all the three candidates were thus rejected, it would be necessary for the Metropolitan to give notice of the circumstance to the Chapter or Clergy of the vacant see, who, in consequence, would be necessitated to meet again, in order to make a fresh postulation, as the Bishops of the province would be obliged to assemble, in order to decide upon it.

From the simple exposure of this plan, as accompanied with the preceding statements, the nature of the restrictions upon the *veto*, which would be necessary for the security of our Church, clearly

present themselves. First, It is requisite that the exercise of it should be confined within certain, and those narrow bounds, because the process which I have described is itself tedious; because the number of Clergymen in each diocese, who are eminently qualified, in every respect, to preside over their brethren, cannot be supposed very great; and, chiefly, because it is indispensably necessary to guard against the admission of a *virtual positive power*, under the name of a *negative power*, and against the intrigues and corruption consequent to it. For example: If a hostile Minister, after putting the *veto* upon *A*, *B*, and *C*, could continue it down to *X* and *Y*,—he might force us to accept of his favourite *Z*, whom we may suppose to be the very tail and disgrace of his cloth. Or (what would happen even under a friendly Minister) if the Crown had an *unlimited veto*, in point of number of times, whenever a Catholic See became vacant, twenty Noblemen or Gentlemen, to answer their own Parliamentary purposes, would hurry up to the Castle, and would insist their respective dependent Priest should be appointed; for which purpose they would inform the Lord Lieutenant that nothing more was necessary than to make use of the *veto* with respect to every other candidate. For a similar reason, no three candidates, or even two candidates, should be presented together,—because this would be to open to the Crown *a certain degree* of *positive power*, and to open a field for intrigue with respect to those individuals. Lastly, It would be necessary to stipulate, that the only ground for the exercise of the *veto* should be the presumed Disloyalty or Sedition of the Candidate, in practice or in principle.

Such, Mr. Editor, is the nature of *that limited veto* which I endeavoured to give an idea of (though perhaps not quite so clearly and in detail as at present) to the Members of Parliament with whom I conversed, previously to the Catholic Debate, and which I represented as calculated to obtain the sanction of the Catholic Bishops of Ireland. There are some copies of a short printed paper, composed by me, and dated May 26, 1808, in the hands of different Gentlemen, which will shew I have not materially varied, in the present exposition, from that which I made at the period of the Debates. Some of the personages, it is very possible, whom I then had the honour of communicating with, may not have fully comprehended my meaning; and, I have reason to suppose, the concessions, as they are stated in this exposure, fall short of the idea which the Public formed of them as they were first laid down;—still I am of opinion they are calculated to afford an additional Pledge of Loyalty and Peaceableness of our Prelates, and to produce a good understanding and mutual confidence between them and the Government of the Country.

III. It is undoubtedly true, that the prelates in question, in their late assembly held in Dublin, September 14 and 15, have declared that it is "Inexpedient to make any alteration in the present

discipline with respect to the mode of nominating Catholic prelates." But I must observe, in justice to myself, that the most distinguished amongst them for the situations which they hold, have avowed to me, and I am sure are prepared to avow again,—"That I had reason to expect they would sanction the limited veto:"—and I must observe in justice to them, by way of obviating the suspicion and obloquy to which they are now exposed, that, to my certain knowledge, they nor any of them have ever been tampered with by Ministry or by any other persons, to disgrace their parliamentary advocates; much less that they or any of them are actuated by those factious motives which there is too much reason to impute to some of their countrymen who are the most averse from the concession of the *veto*, or, indeed by any other motives than a regard for the security of their religion, as they understand them. Lastly, I observe, though there is hardly need of observing it, that the very term "*Inexpedient*," as contradistinguished from *impossible* and *unlawful*, shews that the Resolution in question does not contain any irrevocable doctrine or immutable discipline of their Church. And the explanations on this subject by the titular Primate, Dr. O'Reilly, in his official letter to Lord Southwell and Sir Edward Bellew, lately published in most of the newspapers, distinctly states, that he is certain his fellow-prelates entertained no such meaning of the term in forming their resolution; and that, in his mind, it refers only to *existing circumstances*. Now circumstances may obviously vary, and would thereby alter the *inexpediency* on which the resolution itself was formed.

It is not for me, Sir, to pronounce upon the Resolutions of a numerous Prelacy, who have honoured me with their commission, when deciding upon a question which they consider as exclusively regarding the Catholic Episcopacy of their island; but as they have incurred a great deal of public censure, and are liable, in the course of two months, to incur a great deal more, it is an act of justice to them to state such motives of their determination as I have occasionally collected from their conversation. This is a subject also upon which the public has repeatedly called for information. The following then is the substance of the language which I have at different times heard amongst them:—

"Why are we Catholics, of all descriptions of subjects, not communicating with the Established Church, called upon to admit of an interference on the part of Government in the election of our Chief Pastors? Government does not ask to interfere in the appointment of Presbyterian Moderators, Elders or Deacons, nor in that of Moravian or Wesleyan Bishops, nor in that of the Antinomian Methodistical Preachers, nor in that of the Jewish Priests and Lictors, some of whom, for reasons which we can assign, stand more in need of additional bonds upon them than we do. If it be said, that we possess influence over our people,—do not all the above-mentioned Ministers of Religion possess influence over their

respective flocks in common with ourselves? If on this precise account the King ought to appoint our Bishops, then he ought *a fortiori* to appint the Grand Master, and the other Masters of the Free Masons, and the Directors of the East India Company, and of the Bank, &c. In short, the Constitution ought to be destroyed, and a pure Despotism established in its place."

"We are told that the Crown wishes to have the power of a *veto* in the appointment of our Prelates. Now the Crown actually possesses this power at present; since we, its sworn subjects, are bound in duty and by our oaths, and by a new resolution which we have just passed, to "nominate no persons to the Episcopacy but men of unimpeachable loyalty and peaceableness;" and to shew that we are better judges in this matter than Government itself is, we affirm, that the only individual of our body during the space of thirty years, that is since we have been known to the public, upon the first relaxation of the penal laws, whose conduct has been impeached upon this head, is also the only individual who was appointed at the recommendation of Government, namely of a Minister of high rank who is now at the head of his Majesty's Councils. But what is most to the purpose, we have proved our loyalty in the most critical moments of public danger, when hostile fleets and armies have been upon our coasts, and when rebellion has raged among our deluded people. If it is proved that any other description of Clergy, in times of riot, sedition, or rebellion has exerted themselves more zealously, disinterestedly, or successfully than we have done, we are content to be subject to new and exclusive pledges of loyalty."

"But what principally affects us, is the apprehension that advantage will be taken of us in any new convention which may be proposed, to extort a great deal more from us than we can possibly grant, even to save our lives. We think we perceive a disposition in our friends to raise their demands; and we remember the fable of the Axe-head which applied to the Forest for a saplin to make a handle of; and having obtained that, laid all the lofty trees prostrate. There is the greatest reason for caution on our part, as we have so often been deceived by men in power. At the time of the Union, in particular, what solemn and magnificent promises were not made us, particularly by a Noble Lord, who now stands high in the Ministry, in case we would promote it! We performed our part honestly and successfully; but what is become of the promises of Government? What language does it now hold to us!"

"And why, after all, should we commit ourselves upon questions of such vital importance to our religion, by making concessions to the Crown, when the Crown itself does not call for these concessions, but tells us plainly that it will enter into no negociation whatever with us,—and when the best recommendation to its favours is a determined opposition to us!"

"Lastly, We find, that a vast majority of our people is decidedly

against the concession, insomuch that we should lose their confidence and our influence over them, were we at present to sanction it. Now, it cannot be the wish of our Parliamentary friends, or of Ministers themselves, that we should be deprived of an influence which we have heretofore employed with so much success for the public peace."

Such, Sir, I can assure you, is the substance of the language which I have, from time to time, heard from one or other of the Prelates who formed the resolution so much objected to. If it is not received in full excuse, I think it will be accepted of in extenuation of the decision by those persons of candour who expected, as I myself most certainly did, one of a different tenor. With respect to the last-mentioned argument, which probably will be considered as the strongest of the whole, I must remark, that the ferment which has prevailed among the lower and middle orders of the people on the subject of the veto, was excited partly by inflamed Reports of the Parliamentary Debates in the Newspapers, which represented the concession as *a virtual acknowledgement of the King's Spiritual Supremacy*—and, partly by the manœuvres of a powerful party in Dublin, who considered the measure of laying the foundation of a future good understanding and confidence between the Catholic Clergy and Government, as an effort to break the sceptre of that power which they claim over the minds of the Catholic Public.—They accordingly revenged themselves upon me, though only a subordinate minister in the business, by torrents of abuse, which they continued to pour out against me in *the Dublin Evening Herald*, during the months of August and September last;—and at length by impeaching me, in their *Parliament of Pimlico*, as a "hired Emissary of the Minister;" and by sentencing me to be hanged and burnt in effigy! I trust, however, that neither hope nor fear, neither bribery nor persecution, will make me swerve, in my humble sphere, from the proper line of my duty, as a faithful Subject and an orthodox Catholic, by "*giving to Cæsar the things which belong to Cæsar—and to God the things which belong to God.*"

I am, &c.

Wolverhampton, Nov. 13. 1808. JOHN MILNER.

The Public may have observed that we have very cautiously avoided entering into the merits of the dispute subsisting between the Roman Catholic Prelates of Ireland and the Opposition Leaders in Parliament—"*non nobis tantas componere lites:*"—which body has deceived or been deceived, we do not enquire; but in the heat of the controversy (as it will sometimes happen) things have escaped which it may be of public service to fix and record. Amongst these an extraordinary piece of casuistry, published by the Titular Roman Catholic Bishop of Ossory, appears to be deserving high consideration: this Reverend Person had, it seems, been charged

by a Roman Catholic Gentleman of some leading in Kilkenny, with a breach of promise; to which charge the Prelate has repeated in the following explanation; so little however to the satisfaction of the Gentleman complaining, that he has even urged this very argument as an additional ground for placing in the power of the Crown some check upon the appointment of the Bishops of his own communion. How far he may be justified in this notion, our Readers will judge;—but we cannot help on our part apprehending that the doctrines broached by his Reverence are precisely those, for practising which the Order of Jesuits became obnoxious.

"An Advertisement appeared in the *Leinster Journal* of last Saturday, signed "GEORGE BRYAN," in which I am charged with the breach of a solemn promise. A public attack of this kind necessarily calls on any man to justify his conduct, if in his power. A plain narrative of facts, as they happened, and an explanation of the motives on which I acted, will complete this justification, I hope, in the eyes of any impartial man.

I. I acknowledge that I *promised* to some Gentlemen of the Committee, that I would sign these Addresses when some lines, to which I objected, should be expunged; but I utterly deny having made any *solemn* promise, if by a solemn promise Mr. Bryan means any thing more than a 'serious promise;' for nothing in actions, expressions, or writing, was superadded to the verbal declaration I made of signing the Addresses when corrected.—The nature of the case did not at all require a solemn promise! and the Gentlemen who presented these addresses to me, had too much sagacity and judgment, to alarm my suspicions by such a proposal; for the consequence would probably be, a rejection of the Addresses on he spot.

II. Some days elapsed before the corrected Addresses were again brought to me to be signed. In this interval, many of the Clergy and Laity of this city came to me, and remonstrated against my signing these Addresses. They urged, that these Addresses were calculated to pass an indirect censure on the proceedings of the Prelates in Dublin, and to diminish the respect due to their late Resolutions; that they were preparatory steps to the concession of a veto to the Government, in the nomination of the Catholic Prelates of Ireland, and that a general dislike and disapprobation of these Addresses prevailed among the great majority of the Priests and Catholic Laity of the city. When I ascertained the last fact, I resolved not to sign the Addresses; and was at the same time persuaded that I was guilty of no sin or crime by such a refusal.

"I am convinced that a serious, sincere, and voluntary promise, binds a man who makes it, under the pain of sin, to fulfil it. But I am likewise convinced, that the obligation arising from a promise, ceases in the following cases:—

"I. If a man promises a thing impossible;—for no man can be bound to do a thing impossible to be done.

"II. If a man promises to do any thing sinful or unlawful;—for no promise, though confirmed with an oath, can bind a man to commit sin.

"III. When a person, in whose favour a promise is made, releases the promiser from the promise he has made.

"IV. When a man promises a thing pernicious or useless to the person in whose favour the promise is made.

"V. When, before the promise is fulfilled, the circumstances become so changed, that the person promising, had he foreseen those circumstances, would never have made the promise. On this case I rest my justification;—for had I foreseen or known that my signing these Addresses would produce such alarm or consternation, such dislike and disapprobation as I afterwards found they would, in the minds of the great majority of the Catholic Priests and Laity of this city, I would by no means have consented to sign them.—St. Thomas says 'That a man is not guilty of an untruth in such a 'case;' 'because, when he promised, he intended to perform his 'promise; nor is he unfaithful to his promise, because the circum-'stances are changed afterwards.' This is not only the opinion of St. Thomas, but is also the opinion of all the Theologians and Canonists I ever saw or read.

Kilkenny, Nov. 8, 1808. "JAMES LANIGAN."

LETTER I.

Mr. Editor,—There appeared in *The Morning Chronicle* of the 19th of November, a Letter from the Roman Catholic Bishop Dr. Milner, upon the subject of those Declarations which were made in the last Session of Parliament, with regard to the dispositions of the Roman Catholics of Ireland to admit of his Majesty's *veto* in the future elections of their Bishops. This Letter is so curious, as well as interesting, and is also upon so important a subject, that I cannot help submitting to your consideration, whether you would not do well to give it to your readers.

The letter I allude to becomes additionally interesting at this time, when it is reported that the Roman Catholic Petition is again to be brought forward in the next Session of Parliament; and when, therefore, the subject of these declarations must necessarily come under discussion; for it must appear a most extraordinary circumstance, that though these declarations were made expressly in the name of the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland, and under the authority, as was supposed (and as was asserted) of Dr. Milner, their accredited Agent and Representative in England, yet they have been in substance disclaimed, and most publicly and authoritatively disavowed by those very Bishops, as well as by that very accredited Agent and Representative himself.

Those Noblemen and Gentlemen who gave the Parliament and the Public to believe that they were authorized to make these declarations, and who made them for the direct and express purpose of influencing the decision of Parliament upon a great National Question, must, undoubtedly, when the debates upon that question are renewed, if not before, feel it incumbent upon them to explain the part which they took in this transaction; and the public will be curious to hear whether they will admit to Dr. Milner, That they stated, as under his authority, much which they had no authority to state; or whether they will contend against him, That he now disclaims the authority which he then gave.

That the public were imposed upon by these declarations, to believe that there existed a temper and disposition in the Roman Catholic Bishops, which unquestionably does not now exist, there can be no doubt. Who is to blame for this imposition, it is extremely difficult, on any view of the information at present before the public, to decide. If Dr. Milner's account is to be relied upon, the facts which are to be collected from his different letters (for he has, fortunately for the public, written more letters than one upon this subject) seem to be these:—That he certainly had some communications with the Noblemen and Gentlemen alluded to: that on these occasions he gave them to understand the extent to which *he conjectured* the Irish Roman Catholic Prelates would not be unwilling to concede: that he expressly told them he had no instructions which would authorize him to pledge the consent of those Prelates; but that, somehow or other, those Noblemen and Gentlemen did not accurately understand him (or more correctly, that they completely and fundamentally misunderstood him) both with respect to the authority which he had to act for the Irish Bishops, and also as to the nature and extent of the proposition to which he *conjectured* they might be disposed to accede: that from this it had followed, that these Noblemen and Gentlemen failed indeed in making an accurate representation of what they did not accurately understand; but that there is no ground whatever for imputing to any one of the parties any disingenuous intention to deceive the public or one another.

If this should turn out to be the real state of the case, no small degree of blame will surely still attach to the Noblemen and Gentlemen concerned in this transaction; for before they consented to act as the Parliamentary Spokesmen for the Roman Catholic Bishops, it certainly became them to be well assured of the credentials of the person from whom they derived their authority; and also that the proposal which they made, was indeed that which they were authorized to make; and that they did from carelessness, or from any other cause which they could with reasonable precaution have obviated, mislead the public upon so important a subject.

Such precaution was so obviously their duty, that whatever re-

spect may be due to Dr. Milner's authority, it is not just by his Parliamentary Friends to give complete credit to him, without first hearing their story; especially as upon *one* of the two points on which he was misunderstood (I mean his instructions from Ireland) his statement would lead to the belief that he was so explicit, that it was next to impossible to misunderstand him; whilst upon the *other* (the nature and extent of the proposal itself) he will appear from one of his letters, to which I shall refer, to have been fully prepared to expect that there might be some intention of making some such proposal as that which was made to Parliament: but that he had so rooted and conscientious a conviction of its inadmissibility and unlawfulness, that he had come up to London on purpose to oppose it, if it should be brought forward; and that he would have been prepared, if necessary, to lay down his life in resisting it.—Now, that in explaining himself upon so important a point, upon which he was so interested and anxious to avoid being misunderstood, he, acute, able, and intelligent as he undoubtedly is, should have been so unfortunate as to have explained himself in a manner which led four such intelligent persons as Lord Grenville, Mr. Grattan, the Duke of Norfolk, and Mr. Ponsonby, not only not to understand him, but so totally to misunderstand him, as to conceive that he was authorizing them to make the very proposition which he came up to town purposely to oppose,—is a thing passing strange! and which requires no little stretch of confidence to believe. At all events, it must be admitted that it is so improbable, that it should not be believed on any authority, to the prejudice of these four Statesmen, without first hearing what they have to say upon it.

Under these circumstances, Dr. Milner cannot be surprized if, notwithstanding his statement, the public should hesitate in ascribing the difference between him and his Parliamentary Advocates to mistake alone.

Whether the Roman Catholics and their advocates have dealt quite fairly with one another, may indeed be doubted (this, however, is perhaps rather a matter for them to settle between themselves); but that by some amongst them, if not by all, the Public have not been dealt fairly with, does, in the face of the transaction, appear to be more than probable; and it will be established beyond the possibility of doubt, in this and some future letters, which if you think the subject of sufficient importance to find a place in your Paper, shall be addressed to you.

If this imposition which has been practised upon the public, had arisen out of a mere mistake, surely the persons who unintentionally were parties to it, would have hastened to explain it. There has been abundant opportunity; and it cannot be doubted that they owed it to their own characters, to one another, and to the public, to have avowed the mistake without delay, and to have corrected

it. The backwardness which has been manifested in bringing forward any explanation, is of itself a circumstance which creates much suspicion; and the explanation, such as the public has it from Dr. Milner, if not at contradiction with itself, is so wholly unsatisfactory, that till the subject is more cleared up, it is impossible not to suspect some of the parties in the transaction to have been guilty of very unfair and disingenuous conduct.

How far the charge of backwardness in bringing forward any explanation is well founded, will best appear from a few dates and facts, which can admit of no doubt.

The declarations were first made in the House of Commons by Mr. Grattan and Mr. Ponsonby on the 25th of May; they were referred to and repeated by Lord Grenville and the Duke of Norfolk in the House of Lords on the 27th; yet the declaration of the Roman Catholic Bishops, disavowing the sentiments which their Parliamentary advocates had imputed to them, was not made till near four months afterwards, viz. about the 16th of September. In the beginning of September, Dr. Milner *refused to give any explanation*, in the manner and for the reasons which shall presently be stated: and it was not till the 13th of November that the explanation which is now under consideration was obtained from him. There is, however, at length, *some* explanation obtained from *him;* while to this very hour the other parties to this transaction, the other instruments of this public imposition,—I mean the Parliamentary proclaimers of these declarations,—have contentedly left the public in ignorance of the true state of this question, as far as they are concerned in it; they have made no attempt to disabuse the public confidence, which through their agency has been misled, or to vindicate the part which they, it is to be hoped unintentionally, have borne, in impressing this imposition upon the public mind.

How is all this to be accounted for? Must there not be something extremely inconvenient in explanation, when upon such a subject it has been delayed so long? Or can it be supposed that all or any of these parties could be indifferent to the state of public opinion upon it, or insensible of the importance of explanation, both so far as respects the interests of that great question, on which they feel so much anxiety, and so far as respects themselves also, whose credit, authority, and characters are involved in it?

Dr. Milner, when he wrote his letter for the *Morning Chronicle* on the 13th of November (the day of its date) seems to have written under the impression that explanation was necessary; and he seems desirous upon the occasion of giving this account at last to the public, of referring to some special circumstance which had just occurred, and which might appear to afford a reason for making his explanation public at that time, without impeaching the propriety of the conduct which had been held by himself and others in withholding an explanation upon the subject before. How far

he is successful in this attempt, and how far the explanation itself is satisfactory, shall be the subject of my future letters.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant, A. B.

LETTER II.

In pursuance of the intention announced in my last letter, I proceed to resume the consideration of Dr. Milner's letter of the 13th of November, which was published in the *Morning Chronicle;* but as no small degree of suspicion attaches, not indeed to Dr. Milner alone, but generally to the parties concerned in the subject of that letter, from the manner in which they have delayed to give any explanation of their conduct, it will be of use, previous to an examination into the merits of the explanation itself, to endeavour to see how far Dr. Milner's former silence and conduct upon this subject are consistent with the motives which appear to have influenced him upon the present occasion.

His motives for the present publication are best collected from his own words. He commences his letter to the Editor of the *Morning Chronicle* in the following manner:

"It was not till within these four days that I met with your Chronicles of October the 15th and 17th: observing in these, and some other periodical publications, the manner in which my name is introduced, for the purpose of aspersing some of the most distinguished and honourable characters in the United Parliament, as if they had proposed a plan for a certain restricted interference of the Crown in the nomination of the Catholic Prelates of Ireland, without any warrant for this purpose; and that my sentiments on this subject expressed on one occasion, are quoted in opposition to those which I have expressed on another occasion,—I think myself called upon to vindicate those personages, and to do justice to myself before the public; which, with your permission, I will attempt in your Chronicle. The Public will not be averse from hearing me upon a subject on which it has repeatedly called for information."

It appears, therefore, that his publishing this explanation at that time, or at all, arose from his having observed two passages in the *Morning Chronicle*, which it seems had escaped his notice for near a month after the greatest part of the Public, and especially of his political Friends, the readers of that Paper, must have been in possession of them. From these passages, and from other publications, he perceived that his own consistency was attacked, and that his name was made the means of aspersing his most distinguished Parliamentary Partizans; and therefore, within four days from

meeting with these papers, he publishes from Wolverhampton the explanation of what really passed between him and these most distinguished and honourable characters.

If these passages in the *Morning Chronicle* had afforded him the first intimation of the anxious curiosity of the Public upon this subject, it would not have been surprizing that he should thus have hastened to gratify it. But he tells us, in the very passages above quoted, that the Public had repeatedly called for this information. The anxiety, especially of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, to obtain it, could not have been unknown to him; the declaration of the public Synod of their Prelates, that they thought it inexpedient to accede to any alteration in the mode of the Episcopal appointment, must have been known to him, their accredited agent. Distinct questions had been put to him, in letters published in the *Dublin Herald*, under the signatures of *Laicus* and *Scarsfield*, concerning his late communication with their Parliamentary Advocates;—but to these questions he refused to answer: nay, in a letter of the 8th of September, dated from Cork, and addressed to the Editor of the *Dublin Herald*, he declines answering these enquiries; because he thinks it would be indecorous to his Parliamentary Advocates to explain these points without their consent. I will not, however, trust myself with reporting his reasons, except in his own words; they are as follow:—

"I have always understood that it is highly indecorous to commit to the press any account of a conversation held with another Gentleman concerning business of importance, without the revision or consent of that Gentleman. Certain it is that I have lately experienced such to be the sense of the higher ranks of society, in an instance relative to the matter in question; now it is not in my power to communicate with all the illustrious personages alluded to at the present time; and I have great doubt whether, at any future time, I could obtain their consent to the desired publication."*

It seems, therefore, that on the 8th of September, he could not commit to the press, or, in other words, could not give to the public, an account of this matter; because he had not the authority of his Parliamentary Advocates; and that it would be indecorous to do so without their leave, and without their previous revision of the account which he was to give.

What are we to conclude then, Mr. Editor, upon our receiving at last this explanation from Dr. Milner? Has he been guilty of the indecorum of publishing it without the consent, and without the revision, of his Parliamentary Advocates? Or has he been fortunate enough, in his residence at Wolverhampton, within the short period of those four days, which elapsed from the time of his

* See this Letter in the *Orthodox Churchman's Magazine* for October, taken from the Cork Newspaper.

seeing the passages in the *Morning Chronicle* and the date of his own letter, to procure not only the *consent* of the several Noblemen and Gentlemen with whom he had the conversation, that his account of it should be published, but also their *revision* of that account: a consent and a revision which, it must be remembered, at the date of his letter from Cork, he felt it to be necessary previous to his publication; but which, he said, he could not then procure, and doubted whether he ever should be able to obtain.

It would be by no means immaterial to ascertain this point, if it were possible; for the document would unquestionably become infinitely more important and authentic, if we were at liberty to understand that it was given to the public with the consent, and after the revision of his Parliamentary Advocates. It would then be to be received, and might be argued upon as containing the case, not only of Dr. Milner, but also of his Parliamentary Advocates, as the common and just defence of both parties. But though it may seem to be doing him injustice to conclude without further proof that he had not procured all their consents before he published his letter, since he so very lately had expressed his strong sense of the impropriety of such a publication without procuring them, yet it would be a similar injustice to these Noblemen and Gentlemen to consider them, without further proof, to be privy to this statement, consenting to its publication, and acquiescing in its accuracy,—especially when there seems so much reason to doubt the fact of their being in any way parties to its publication; for, in the first place, it is not easy to conceive how such consents could have been procured within that short space of four days, which elapsed between his meeting with the passages in the *Morning Chronicle* which provoked him to publish, and the date of the publication itself. But, besides this, it is more candid to believe, as it is surely more probable (provided the account Dr. Milner has given of what passed is the true one) that he should, after a little reflection (notwithstanding his expression in his letter from Cork) have changed his opinion, and have ceased to entertain any apprehension that there would be the least indecorum, under the circumstances in which the account was called for, in giving it to the Public, without waiting for any consent at all. Nay, indeed, Dr. Milner must pardon any one who may feel great difficulty in believing that this reason, so given in his letter from Cork, for refusing to afford the explanation which was asked of him, could at any time have appeared to him to have the weight which he there ascribes to it, or that it could have been the real reason which influenced him in determining to withhold it.

For what was the case? Dr. Milner, the accredited agent of the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland, finds that his name and his authority had been used to convey to the public a false opinion, injurious, according to his present statement, to his character for Roman Catholic orthodoxy, and injurious also to the orthodoxy of his constituents, the Roman Catholic Prelates; and that this false

opinion had prevailed because the distinguished and honourable public Characters with whom he had communicated upon an important public question, had misunderstood, and consequently misrepresented the effect of his communication. Is it then possible to believe that Dr. M. should really think that he not only could not, without doing something extremely indecorous towards those Gentlemen, set himself and those Roman Catholic Bishops right, by committing the true state of the facts to the press, unless he had the consent of those illustrious and honourable Characters? or that he could seriously doubt whether he ever could procure their consent? What idea must he entertain of their honour and of their justice, if he forms this strange opinion of them! The conversation which he represents as so confidential, was evidently held for the express purpose of having the result of it communicated to the Public;—these Gentlemen had given to the public their statement of it; that statement was false; and Dr. Milner could not, without indecorum, communicate a true one! A sense of honour, truly, towards those who had misrepresented him in a matter so important to his character, and to that of his Reverend Constituents—so essntial, as he says, to the interests of the Roman Catholic Religion—was to oblige him to remain under the effect of such misrepresentation! under the imputation of having authorized a proposition which (as we shall see presently in another of his letters) he says, he had rather die than consent to!

If the matter rested here, would it not be difficult to suppose that Dr. Milner, with his experience of the world, could really entertain so strange an opinion, as that any man's consent could be necessary to justify the publication of such a conversation,—especially when it became so essential for his own justification? or that with his high estimation of the honour of these distinguished characters, he could believe them capable of harbouring so unjust a wish as to be desirous of withholding their consent from his publishing that which every principle of fairness, candour, and justice would have made them anxious that he should have the opportunity to promulgate? But it does not rest here; for the account of this conversation, which he could not, without violating all decorum, commit to the press in September, it appears by his Letter to the *Morning Chronicle*, that he had committed to the press on the 26th of May. We have his own words for it:—

"There are copies of a short printed paper, composed by me, and dated May 26, 1808, in the hands of different Gentlemen, which will shew that I have not materially varied in the present exposition, from that which I made at the time of the debates."

It may be said, perhaps, that this printed paper was prepared for private use only, and that though such printing was, literally speaking, committing to the press, yet it was not so in the sense in which that expression is used in the Letter of the 8th of Sept. from Cork, viz. as equivalent to publishing. The paper, however, it seems,

was not only printed, but in the hands of *different Gentlemen;* not described as the Noblemen and Gentlemen with whom the conversation passed,—but *several* Gentlemen. Now, though the indecorum might not be so great in its degree, it is certainly equally great in its principle, to communicate a confidential conversation to a *few* as to *many*. But (what is still more extraordinary than all this) although in his Letter from Cork, of the 8th of September, he says it would be indecorous to give the account without the consent of those whose consent he doubted whether he should ever be able to obtain,—yet, in point of fact, he had on the 1st of August preceding, given the account in a letter from Wolverhampton, to a Parish Priest in Ireland: a letter which has since been published, though not as it should seem with Dr. Milner's authority, in the *Dublin Herald* of Sept. 21, 28, and October 10.

The conversation, therefore, which was so private and confidential, that it would have been indecorous for Dr. Milner to publish it in September, he had printed, and in a circle more or less extensive, had circulated on the 26th of May;—he had also given an account of it in his Letter to a Parish Priest of the 1st of August from Wolverhampton; and he now gives it to the public, through the *Morning Chronicle*, in a letter of the 13th of November. May not, therefore, all this justify a little hesitation in believing that the fear of violating the decorum of private confidence was the true reason for declining to give the account which was required of him in September?

Two other passages from his letter to the *Morning Chronicle* should here be adverted to; they are these:—

"It is very possible that some of the personages whom I had the honour then of communicating with, may not have fully comprehended my meaning; and I have reason to suppose that the concessions, as they are here stated in this exposure, fall short of the idea which the public formed of them, as first laid down."

If, then, he has reason so to suppose, how can he possibly reconcile to common justice, either towards the Roman Catholics, or the Protestant Public, to have delayed the exposure so long? With these observations I conclude this part of the subject, in perfect conviction that any person who has taken the trouble of wading through this long Letter, must be satisfied, whatever opinion he may form upon Dr. Milner's explanation (the merits of which I will canvas in my next) that the delay which has attended the publication of that explanation remains most unsatisfactorily accounted for.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant, A. B.

LETTER III.

It must undoubtedly be admitted, that provided the explanation itself be satisfactory at last, it matters, comparatively speaking,

but little, how long it has been delayed; and indeed what has been said in the last Letter should not be understood as intended to urge the delay as a substantive offence; but to urge it, and remark upon it, only as affording strong ground of suspicion, if not of proof, that there is something extremely difficult and aukward in the way of explanation; that it is to such difficulty that the delay is to be ascribed; and that consequently when the explanation itself is examined, prudence requires it should be received with considerable caution and jealousy.

It now remains to be shewn, that the explanation itself (as the presumption arising from this delay would lead one to expect) does prove most unsatisfactory; and so far from its being any longer matter of surprize that it should have been so much delayed, the surprize will rather be, that if the truth could afford no better means of explanation, any explanation should have been attempted at all.

Dr. Milner had, it must be admitted, a very difficult task to execute. He had written a letter * to a Parish Priest, which is dated from Wolverhampton, the 1st of August, 1808. In that letter, after remarking that he had not been the first to introduce this delicate subject of the King's interference in the election of their Bishops, and mentioning various publications, in which the opinion in favour of such interference had been encouraged, as he says, to a very mischievous effect,—he adds, "I mention these circumstances not by way of intimating any acquiescence in the measure."—"The measure, taken as it was proposed" (not, observe, as the papers had misrepresented the Parliamentary speeches, but "as it was proposed") "I know it to be unlawful, and schismatical. So far, indeed, from acquiescing in it, I wrote most pressingly, during the last Spring, to two of your venerable Metropolitans, in order to consult with them on the best mode of defeating it; and it is a fact, which I declare upon my conscience, "that my chief motive for going up to London about ten weeks ago" (the Letter being dated on the 1st of August, ten weeks before, will carry us back to a few days before the debates, in which these declarations were made) "was to oppose the measure, had it been brought forward in Parliament, as I was fearful would be the case; being deeply conscious that it was my duty to do so at the expence of my life."

And in another letter from Dr. Milner, dated from Cork, on the 8th of September, and addressed to the Editor of *The Dublin Herald* (and which may be seen in *The Cork Mercantile Chronicle* of the 12th of September, and in *The Orthodox Churchman's Magazine* for October) there are these words;—"I may add, in justice to them" (the Parliamentary Advocates) "as well as to myself, that after the debate was over, they acknowledged themselves to have

---

* See Dublin Evening Herald, Sept. 21, 28, and Oct. 10.

advanced certain positions, the most alarming of all that were made, *for which they had no warrant, but their own way of viewing the subject.*"

Having such an opinion of the measure which was proposed, and recollecting this acknowledgement of his Parliamentary Advocates, namely, that they had advanced, as from his authority, that for which they had no warrant but from their own view of the subject; and having written letters which were before the Public, in which this opinion and this acknowledgment were asserted,—it must be admitted that Dr. Milner undertook no very easy task in his letter to *The Morning Chronicle*, viz. "at once to vindicate his own consistency," and "to rescue his Parliamentary Advocates from the aspersions which have been cast upon them, as if they had proposed a plan for a certain restricted interference of the Crown, on the nomination of the Catholic Prelates, without any warrant for this purpose." For if the proposal which was made, was brought forward by those who made it, as under the warrant of Dr. Milner's authority; and if that proposal was so unlawful and schismatical, that it was his duty to oppose it at the expence of his life, it seems to follow, to a common understanding at least, either that Dr. Milner had given his authority to this unlawful and schismatical proposal, or that those who made it had brought it forward without that warrant or authority which they pretended: and again, if they brought it forward as under his authority, (and he says, in the letter in *The Dublin Herald*, that they acknowledged that they did do so *without* his authority, and upon their own view of the subject) either they must wilfully and knowingly have asserted to Parliament that which was not true, and which they have since acknowledged to be otherwise than as they asserted it; or Dr. Milner grossly slanders them in this Letter of his to the Editor of *The Dublin Herald*. Thus the matter seems to stand between Dr. Milner and his Friends: Either they have falsely assumed Dr. Milner's authority, or he has falsely denied an authority which he gave; and the more Dr. Milner's letters are examined, the more I am confident this will appear. He, therefore, and his illustrious and distinguished friends, have to settle between them which of these alternatives are to be adopted; and Dr. Milner, whose letter is written at once to defend his own consistency, and to vindicate his Parliamentary Advocates from the foul charge which has been brought against them," as he says, "by their political adversaries," has a task of difficulty, which even the acknowledged ability and adroitness of Dr. Milner himself will certainly be found unequal to accomplish. This will be clearly evinced by an examination of the five following questions:—

First, Whether these Parliamentary Advocates did tender any proposition, as under the authority of Dr. Milner, from the Roman Catholic Bishops? — and, if they did,

Then, secondly, Whether they had any right to tender *any* proposition as under *any* warrant from Dr. Milner?

Thirdly, Whether, if they had *any* warrant to tender *any* pro-

position, they did tender it under the sort of warrant which he gave them?

Fourthly, Whether Dr. Milner himself had any authority from the Irish Prelates? — and,

Fifthly, Whether the proposition itself, which they did tender, was that which he had authorized them to make?

Upon these questions, the first thing to be done is to advert to Dr. Milner's own testimony.

In stating what passed upon being summoned and interrogated by some of the leading Members, he expresses himself thus in his Letter to the *Morning Chronicle*: —

"My answer, in the different communications I had upon this subject, was to the following effect: — 'That I had no *specific* instructions on the subject' (In his Letter to the Parish Priest, of the 11th of August, before referred to, his words are, 'My answer on the different occasions alluded to, was uniformly, that I had *no* instructions from the Irish Prelates on the subject proposed'); and that there was no time previous to the expected debate for obtaining any instructions from Ireland: that I knew full well the Catholic Bishops could not give to his Majesty, nor he, as Head of the Established Church, receive a right of patronage, or any other positive powers in this concern, as that would be an incontestable pledge and act of *mutual religious communion*; nevertheless, that I had very good reason to believe the Catholic Bishops of Ireland would not be averse, *under certain circumstances*" (what circumstances?— were they specified?) "and as part of a general arrangement, from conceding to the Crown a certain negative power or *veto*, such as would, in my opinion, afford the desired pledge, *provided always* that the power were limited within *the bounds necessary for the safety* as well as *for the independency* of the Church." (Were these bounds specified, or who was to be the judge of what was necessary for that object?) "and, *in such* manner as to prevent the *negative power* from becoming a *positive* power" (was this manner specified?—and what was it?) "and from being otherwise abused for the oppression, corruption, or detriment of our religion." — He then proceeds: —

"Whoever duly weighs this statement, sees that our Parliamentary Advocates were warranted in the declarations which they made in Parliament, *to the extent and in the manner here set down*; and it is my duty thus publicly to avow the share which I took in the *warrant* under which they spoke of the *presumed disposition* of the Irish Prelates" (a curious *warrant* this, — the warrant of a *presumed disposition!*) "to make the desired concessions.—On the other hand, he will see that I did not hold out any, the most distant, prospect of these Prelates yielding to the Crown *any degree* of ecclesiastical supremacy, or *actual power*, *direct* or *indirect*, over the Catholic Church in Ireland. In short, he will acquit the honourable personages alluded to, of the foul fraud imputed to them by their political adversaries; and he will acquit me also of the in-

consistencies with which I have been charged in the newspapers, with respect to my declarations and writings upon different occasions."

Surely, Dr. Milner runs here too fast to his conclusions. Whoever, indeed, duly weighs Dr. Milner's Statement, if it can really be supposed to contain any thing like an accurate account of what passed, will acquit these honourable and noble persons of any fault, and their understandings of any defect of comprehension, if they did not correctly understand what Dr. Milner meant; and if they did not collect any accurate and precise idea from a statement so studiously obscure, and so elaborately equivocal and indefinite: — but how they can be acquitted of folly and credulity in the extreme, in pledging themselves in Parliament to any thing whatever upon the sanction of such a statement as the Doctor's; — how they could fail suspecting that deception might, by possibility at least, lurk in these generalities, even if it were not intended to be disguised by them, is more than can easily be conceived.

Dr. Milner says, "It will appear they *were warranted* in the declarations they made in Parliament, *to the extent and in the manner here set down.*" Now, does Dr. Milner (aye or no) mean to assert or insinuate, That the declarations which his Parliamentary Advocates made in Parliament, *were* ONLY *to the extent and in the manner here set down?* If he *does* mean to assert or insinuate this, Where was his sincerity when, in writing to the Parish Priest in August last, he said, That "the measure taken as it was proposed, *he knew to be unlawful and schismatical?* or, when he said, in his other Letter from Cork, That they had acknowledged that they *had advanced* the *most alarming* propositions, *without any warrant?* or, if he does *not* mean this, Where is his sincerity now, when he endeavours to frame a defence for his Parliamentary Friends, by saying, "It will appear that they *were warranted* in the declarations they *made*, to the extent and in the manner here set down," when, in fact, they made them to *an extent and in a manner far different;* and when all that the truth would have justified him in stating was, "That it will appear they *would* HAVE *been* warranted *if* they *had* made their declarations to this extent, and in this manner only, but that from some cause or other, they *did make* them to a *much greater* extent, and therefore they were not warranted? Is it possible for any degree of candour to see this miserable quibble, this shuffle of language, in any other light than as a disingenuous (I had almost said Jesuitical) attempt to impose upon a careless reader to believe that they *had a warrant* for what they *did do*, while he reserves for himself the means of shewing that his words, upon a critical examination of the passage, do not convey any such sense? If there ever was an instance of keeping the word of truth to the ear and denying it to the sense, this passage exhibits it.

These observations, which I could not resist from making, while the passages of the Doctor's Letter were immediately before me,

have diverted me from the order on which I intended to observe upon it; and have proved of such a length as to render it necessary to bring this Letter to a close.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant, A. B.

LETTER IV.

The two first questions which I proposed in my last Letter to examine, were, 1st, Whether Dr. Milner's Parliamentary Advocates did tender *any* proposition, as under the authority of Dr. Milner, from the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops? and, 2dly, If they did, Whether they had any right to tender *any* proposition, as under *any* warrant from him? Upon these two questions there can be no rational doubt. Dr. Milner's own statement proves that they did tender *some* proposition as under his warrant; and that he had given them *some* warrant to tender it. He admits, nay, he contends, as we have seen before, that, from his own statement, it appears that they were *warranted* in making the declarations which they made "to the extent, and in the manner there laid down."

But on the third question, namely, Whether they did tender the proposition under the sort of warrant which he gave them? — Dr. Milner says, in *one* letter, that he distinctly stated to them that he had *no* instructions; and in *another*, that he had no *specific* instructions from the Irish Prelates to that purpose: but still he admits that these Members of Parliament did make *some* statement; and that he did them *some* warrant, though he afterwards calls it "the *warrant of a presumed disposition.*" If any one should not precisely understand what this expression means, he may find his excuse in the singularity of it; but I suppose the meaning to be the *warrant* of Dr. Milner's *conjecture* of what he *presumed* was or would be the *disposition* of the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops; and if therefore, instead of stating the proposition as upon a *conjecture* and *presumption* of Dr. Milner, his Parliamentary Advocates stated it was from the authority of the Bishops themselves, communicated by Dr. Milner, they must, I apprehend, according to Dr. Milner's meaning (though I confess it is rather difficult to understand exactly what his meaning is) fall justly under the very censure from which it was his professed purpose to defend them.

With respect to the real state of this fact, viz. the degree of authority which they professed to act under, and the nature of the warrant which they represented Dr. Milner to have given them, it is difficult, undoubtedly, to ascertain it with precision, as there is no record of what is stated in a debate in either House of Parliament; and a general reference to what the public impression was upon the occasion, is too loose to be satisfactory.

But upon reference to such impression, every man who read the newspapers at the time, or who had opportunity of access to Members of Parliament, must recollect that it was universally under-

stood to have been a proposition made upon the authority of Dr. Milner, in the name of the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland. Upon referring to such imperfect reports as Mr. Cobbett furnishes to the public (and his Report is much fuller than any other which I have seen of these Debates) it will appear (vol. xi. p. 556) that Mr. Grattan, in introducing this proposition, is made to say, "I have a proposition to make, — a proposition which the Catholics have *authorized* me indeed to name."

Sir J. Cox Hippesley (*ibid.* p. 597) says, That "this proposition had been introduced *under the authority* of Dr. Milner," whom he describes as "himself a Prelate of the Roman Catholic Communion, and who *was formally accredited to this country* by *these Prelates as the organ of their sentiments, to treat in their behalf, if any such treaty became necessary, and to propose or assent to such measures as might eventually be connected with the objects of the present discussion;*" and Mr. Ponsonby having stated his view of the proposition in his original speech, was called upon by Mr. Yorke to explain by what authority he had made it: and, in page 619 of the same book, he is made to answer, That he made the statement upon *the authority of* Dr. Milner, who was a Roman Catholic Bishop in this country; and who *was authorized by the Catholic Bishops of Ireland to make the proposition, in case the measure of Roman Catholic emancipation should be acceded to.*

Lord Grenville's expressions are (*ibid.* p. 649) "It is unquestionably proper that the Crown should exercise an effectual negative over the appointment of the persons called to execute those (the Episcopal) functions: — *to this the Catholics of Ireland* DECLARE themselves perfectly willing to accede." And in his reply (p. 649) the proposition relative to the future appointment of Catholic Bishops in Ireland, was, to his knowledge, long in contemplation, although the *Catholics had not, until lately, thought proper to make it public.*

Let the reader now recollect Dr. Milner's Statement: that he told all these Parliamentary Advocates of his, "That he had *no specific* instructions from the Roman Catholic Bishops, and that they only spoke under the warrant of the *presumed dispositions of the Irish Prelates*," — and then let him determine whether what Mr. Grattan said of the "proposition which he was authorized to name," — Sir J. Cox Hippesley, of "the accredited authority of Dr. Milner, under whose authority the proposition was introduced;" — Mr. Ponsonby, of "the proposition which Dr. Milner was authorized to make," — as well as the effect of Lord Grenville's expressions, and then, I say, let him determine Whether these declarations were consistent with a due and just execution only of what Dr. Milner can, by possibility, mean by his "warrant of a presumed disposition," under which alone, according to him, they were authorized to state any thing? and, surely, he will have no difficulty in perceiving that Dr. Milner and his Parliamentary Advocates are directly and flatly at issue and contradiction with each

other upon this point, namely, the nature and extent of the warrant under which they were authorized to submit the proposition to Parliament: but this is far from all; for, if it be clear that these two parties, whom it was the object of Dr. Milner's Letter to the *Morning Chronicle* to reconcile, are at great variance with respect to the nature and extent of *the warrant* under which the proposition was made, it will be found to be still infinitely clearer, that they vary almost diametrically as to the nature and extent of the *proposition* itself, which, under any warrant (be it of express authority or of presumed disposition) they undertook, in the face of Parliament and of the Nation, to tender in the name of the Irish Bishops.

But, before I proceed to the examination of that question, there is another of some curiosity at least, if not of use, which I proposed to consider. I mean the question, Whether, in point of fact, Dr. Milner had *any* instructions or authority from the Roman Catholic Prelates to make *any* proposal at all? This is a question which it would be idle to lose much time in discussing, especially as it is one on which it would be extremely difficult to come to any satisfactory conclusion. If there were no other letter from Dr. Milner upon this subject than that which is published in the *Morning Chronicle*, the necessary conclusion would be, that he had some general, but no specific instructions; but comparing this with the letter from Wolverhampton to the Parish Priest, it will appear that Dr. Milner states the matter differently in the last-mentioned letter. He there says, That he *uniformly* told his friends he had *no* instructions on the subject proposed; in the *other*, he says, he told them, He had no *specific* instructions on this subject. How it happens that his two accounts of what he told them vary in this degree, Dr. Milner alone can explain. The statement that he had no *specific* instructions, would naturally imply that he had some general instructions; and if he had any instructions, however general and unspecific, how happened it that (as his letter from Cork expresses it) he did say, and that *uniformly*, that he had *none?* If, again, he really had *none*, how happened it that his expression in his other letter is, that he had no *specific* instructions? It would be *literally true* indeed if he had *no* instructions, that he had no *specific* instructions; because if he had *none at all, of any description*, he could have none that were specific.

The epithet, therefore, would introduce no *express* falsehood,—but would it not imply, to those who heard it used, that he had some general instructions upon the subject? — and thus, by inducing those to whom he used it, to think he had some instructions, give to his communication an apparent weight and sanction, which, upon that subject, ought not to have belonged to it: but if it were not for this positive assertion in his letter from Cork, that he uniformly told his Parliamentary Friends that he had no instructions, the inference strongly to be drawn from other circumstances would be, that he had some.

In his letter from Cork, above referred to, as a reason for withholding an answer to the questions which had been put to him in the *Dublin Evening Herald*, in addition to that already noticed, of the indecorum of publishing a confidential conversation, he says, "It would evidently be still more indecorous, it would even be a crime too bad to be named, to betray the confidence of the venerable Prelates, whose business I so lately transacted. Laicus complains, that they themselves have thought proper to keep him in the dark with respect to it; and he applies to me, their confidential agent, to inform him of it." — If Dr. Milner had no instructions from his constituents upon this subject, where would be the crime, when he found much prejudice excited against them in the minds of their Roman Catholic flock, on account of the instructions which they were supposed to have given, to have stated that they had really given him none? If, indeed, they had given him any, it might be to betray them inconveniently enough, had he disclosed the fact, when they wished it to be concealed; but unless he had some instructions from them upon this point, which, under present circumstances at least, they do not feel it convenient to have disclosed, it is difficult to conceive how he could have been misled into the idea that it would be a crime to tell the world, not what his instructions were, nor even what they were not,—but merely and solely that he had *no instructions at all;* and that, consequently, whatever he had said in conversation, whether more or less consistent with what might have been expected from him, and whether rightly or wrongly understood and represented by those to whom he had said it, had nothing in the remotest degree to do with any instruction from the Roman Catholic Bishops; and that no possible responsibility, therefore, could attach upon them on account of it. Could such a statement betray any confidenoe, or constitute any crime? Nay, does it not seem that fairness and justice towards his constituents would, under such circumstances, have imperiously required it of him?

But besides this, the conduct of the Roman Catholic Bishops themselves seem to afford reason to conclude, that they had given some instructions or authority to Dr. Milner upon this subject;—for what do they do? They find a strong impression made in the minds of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, in consequence of this proposal. In the language which Dr. Milner, in his Letter to the *Morning Chronicle*, puts into the mouths of some of them: "We find (he makes them say) that a vast majority of our people is decidedly against the concession, even, insomuch, that we should lose their confidence and our influence over them were we at present to sanction it." Under this impression, at a synod held by them in Dublin, on the 14th and 15th of September, they declare, that "It is the decided opinion of the Roman Catholic Prelates of Ireland, that *it is inexpedient* to make any alteration in the common mode hitherto observed in the nomination of Irish Roman

Catholic Bishops; which mode long experience has proved to be unexceptionable, wise, and salutary." Now, can it possibly be supposed that, if, when they were assembled and considering the effect of those declarations in Parliament; when they were impressed with a strong sense of the decided disapprobation of a vast majority of their people to this concession, — when they were desirous of recovering the confidence and preserving the influence which they might fear to lose, in consequence of the proposal, can it possibly be supposed, that if they had given *no authority, or no instructions, specific* or *general*, that they would not have availed themselves of such an opportunity of declaring that fact? One simple declaration to that effect, would not only have restored to them the confidence of their flock, but it would have proved that they had never done any thing upon the subject for a moment to lose or to shake it; and when, instead of this, they content themselves with barely stating that it is "inexpedient," in language which Dr. Milner thinks justifies him in arguing that it is an inexpediency "which depends upon existing circumstances, and which obviously may vary," — the inference surely is, That they could not in truth and honour deny the fact that they had given some authority. Such certainly would at least be the inference which I should have drawn from this circumstance, if it had not been for Dr. Milner's declaration in his Letter to the Parish Priest, That he had *uniformly* declared he had *no* instructions from them *whatever* upon that subject. As it is, however, there are difficulties both ways; and this question must, as far as depends upon any materials which are, to my knowledge at present, before the public, remain involved in some degree of uncertainty. I am aware, that to many readers it may seem a matter of very inconsiderable importance whether this difficulty should ever be removed; but, on the other hand, I am confident, that to others it will appear to be a question affecting in no slight degree the good faith and sincerity of the transaction itself, as well as the consistency of the account which Dr. Milner has given of it.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant, A. B.

LETTER V.

Having endeavoured to shew in my former letters (with what success you, Mr. Editor, and your readers, must determine) that a proposition was made by the Parliamentary Advocates of the Roman Catholics, in the name of the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland, under the asserted authority of Dr. Milner; and that it was made under the assertion of a degree of warrant or authority, which Dr. Milner now says he never gave; and having further shewn, in my last letter, the difficulty that there is in ascertaining whether those Bishops had really given Dr. Milner any authority at all, I now proceed to the last question which I proposed to consider; namely, Whether the proposition which was so made (under

whatever degree of warrant or authority) was or was not conformable to that which Dr. Milner had authorized his Parliamentary Friends to make?

I shall here again begin with endeavouring to understand, from Dr. Milner's statements, what the proposition was which he had given his Parliamentary Friends reason to believe would meet with the concurrence of the Irish Bishops; and I shall then compare it with the proposition, as it was really stated according to the best account which can be procured of it.

Dr. Milner's own words, in his letter in the *Morning Chronicle* on this point, are as follows: —

"That I know full well the Catholic Bishops could not give to his Majesty, nor he, as Head of the Established Church, receive a right of patronage, or any other positive power in this concern, as this would be an incontestable pledge and act of mutual religious communion; nevertheless, I had very good reason to believe the Catholic Bishops in Ireland would not be averse, under CERTAIN *circumstances*, and as a part of a general arrangement, from conceding to the Crown a certain negative power or veto, such as would, in my opinion, afford the desired pledge, provided that this power were limited within the bounds necessary for the safety, as well as the independency of our Church; and in such manner as to prevent the negative power from becoming a positive power, or from being otherwise abused for the oppression, corruption, or detriment of our religion."

The questions which occur to be asked upon this statement are, What these limitations were to be? — and, Whether, whatever they were, they were specified by Dr. Milner to his Parliamentary Advocates, and acceded to by them? — and, if so, Whether they were stated by them to parliament?

To some of these questions at least, an answer can, in part, be supplied by a reference to Dr. Milner's other Letters. In his letter from Wolverhampton to the Parish Priest, which has been before referred to, the account given of the conversation with his Parliamentary Friends, is in these words:

"I said, however, that I had good reason to believe that they (the Roman Catholic Bishops) never would consent to attribute any positive power to the Crown, not even so far as to its selecting one Candidate out of three of the Prelate's own proposing; nevertheless, *that in case there was to be a friendly Ministry*, and that the emancipation were to take place, I thought they would not be averse to consult his Majesty's Ministers, after they had themselves chosen, in the usual way, the person fittest to be presented to the Pontiff, in order to ascertain whether those Ministers entertained any suspicion of the purity of this person's civil and political conduct and principles, which is in fact to ascribe a negative power and interference in this transaction. I added, however, that they would not, according to my notions, allow the Crown an unrestrained negative power; as this might be made to operate like a

positive power, and open a door to intrigue and ambition; but they would wish to restrain the negative power, or veto, to a reasonable number of times. *I did not understand*, as it has been objected to me, an *indefinite number of times* to be left open for contention between the Ministry and the Prelates, as the case should occur; but a definite number, whether *twice*, *thrice*, or *four* times, to be settled by the latter, whenever the proposed treaty should be actually concluded." (And in the postscript to that letter) "I must add here, that in my communication with certain Members of the Legislature, *equally powerful and friendly*, I contended so strongly and so repeatedly, for even the negative power being restricted to a certain number of times, to be *afterwards determined by the Prelates* themselves" (for on this delicate point I would not so much as hazard an opinion) "that I conceived myself to run the greatest risk of *losing their friendship.*"

And in his letter from Cork to their Editor of the *Dublin Herald*, after stating the manner in which he thought there could be no objection to the King's exercising his negative upon the three first candidates who were proposed, upon the supposition that all three might be rejected, he says, "*Here I conceive its negative power* must necessarily *end;* for, I repeat it, I would rather lose my life than consent to an Uncatholic Government's obtaining any actual power, or such a negative power as might grow into an actual power."

Taking therefore those letters as explanatory of that which Dr. Milner wrote to *The Morning Chronicle*, it appears that the circumstances under which Dr. Milner said the Bishops would, in his opinion concede, were—the case of the emancipation taken place, *and the existence of a friendly Ministry.* And the limitation which was to prevent the negative from growing into a positive, was—*that the negative power was to be restricted to a certain number of times;* and the necessity of this limitation was so strongly and so repeatedly contended for by Dr. Milner, that he thought he had run the greatest risk of losing the friendship of *his most powerful and friendly* Parliamentary Advocates, by the earnestness with which he urged it.

This last circumstance is the more worthy notice, because it is impossible, *if* it was urged so strongly and so repeatedly, that it could have been either *misunderstood* or *forgotten*; and that the whole was to depend upon the contingency of there *existing* what he calls *a friendly Ministry;* without which, the whole arrangement was to fall to nothing, was so very remarkable a circumstance, and one so peculiarly flattering to his Parliamentary Friends, that it is also impossible that, if such a circumstance had been specified, they could have either misunderstood it or forgotten it.

Having thus seen from Dr. MILNER's statement in these letters, what was the proposition which had his sanction, let us now see what was the proposition which was made to Parliament; and if it shall appear that, instead of its having been conditional, and dependent *upon the existence of a friendly Administration*, no such

condition was mentioned; and that, instead of the limitation upon the negative power to a certain number of times, there was no such limitation mentioned or hinted at,—it will follow that there has been something most extraordinary, if not most disengenuous, in the conduct of some of the parties to this transaction. That Dr. MILNER should so far forget himself as to state that he accompanied the proposition which he made to his Parliamentary Advocates, with those important conditions and limitations, when in point of fact he never mentioned them, is what every candid mind will feel the greatest reluctance to believe; but that those public Men, the Parliamentary Advocates of Dr. MILNER, should have made their statement of the proposition as coming from Dr. MILNER, and either intentionally or through inadvertence, have omitted to mention these limitations and conditions which constitute such essential parts of it,—is what it is equally repugnant to every honourable feeling to suppose possible. It will, therefore, remain for Dr. MILNER to shew how far his Parliamentary Friends are vindicated from the foul charge which he says has been brought against them by their political adversaries; or else to vindicate himself from having given an erroneous account of the conversation which passed between them and him.

I shall here again refer to Mr. COBBETT's *Parliamentary Register*, as the source from whence we may derive the best account of what really passed; and, at all events, one which cannot be suspected of having intentionally misrepresented the effect of it. In that *Register* (vol. xi. page 556) Mr. GRATTAN is made to say,—

"I have a proposition to make, a proposition which the Catholics have authorized me indeed to name. It is this:—That in the future nomination of Bishops his Majesty may interfere and exercise his Royal Prerogative, by *putting a negative upon such nomination*; that is, in other words, to say,—*That no Catholic Bishop shall be appointed without the entire approbation of his Majesty.*"

Again, in a following page,—

"The proposition will make a double connection. The two Churches will be as one, and the King at the head."

Mr. PONSONBY (ibid. p. 607)—after adverting to the connection between the Roman Catholic Clergy and the Pope, as the most weighty circumstance,—is made to say,

"The Catholics considered amongst themselves; and they determined to give to the Government every information upon the subject, and to make their *Superior Clergy subject to the Crown.*"

Then he proceeds to state the manner in which the three candidates are now elected and sent to the Pope; and he goes on,

"Now they have agreed," (not, *it is conjectured by Dr. Milner, that they will agree, but, after considering among themselves, they have determined and agreed*) "When the names are returned, to send them to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; and if he should object to all these, to strike them out, and send *other three* in their

stead, until the King's approbation of some one of them be received. Even then, they send that name to Rome to receive the approbation of the Pope. This, however, is giving the real and effectual nomination to the Crown."

And afterwards, in his explanation upon a question put to him by Mr. YORKE, he says,

"He made the statement upon *the authority of Dr. Milner*, who was a Catholic Bishop in this Country, and *who was authorized by the Catholic Bishops of Ireland* to make the proposition *in case the* measure of Catholic emancipation should be acceded to. (No mention of the other condition—*the existence of a friendly Administration.*) The proposition was this:—That the person to be nominated to any vacant Bishopric should be submitted to the King's approbation; and that if the approbation was refused, another person should be proposed, and so on in succession, until his Majesty's approbation should be obtained; so that the appointment should finally rest with the King."

Now, let me ask Whether it be possible to reconcile this account of the Speeches in Parliament with Dr. MILNER's account of what he authorized them to state? Dr. MILNER says the arrangement was to take place under certain *circumstances*, explained by his letters to the Roman Catholic Priest, to mean *the existence of a friendly Administration.* This essential circumstance, this *sine qua non*, this condition precedent to the whole, is not once mentioned or glanced at by either of the speakers who made the proposition. The negative power, says Dr. MILNER, "was to be *limited to a certain number of times;*"—and in his Letter from Cork—"*must necessarily end at the rejection of these Candidates.*" Mr. PONSONBY says it is to be exercised "*until* the King's *approbation of some one of them be received.*" And in the other passage, "*and so on in succession, till his* Majesty's *approbation be obtained.*" Dr. MILNER says, the *negative* power was to be *so limited, that it should not grow into a positive power;* nor be an "*actual*" or "*effective*" power, *direct* or *indirect!* Mr. PONSONBY, however, considers it as giving an *actual effective* power to the Crown; "This, is however," he says, "giving the *real and effectual nomination to the Crown;*" and again, "*so that the appointment should finally rest with the King.*"

But the matter by no means rests here. Dr. MILNER, as has been shewn before from his own Letter, was present in the debate in the House of Commons. The debate in the House of Lords did not take place till the next day but one; there was therefore a whole intervening day, in which Dr. MILNER might communicate with his Noble Friends; and there could not possibly have been a better opportunity for correcting any mistake which had occurred in the House of Commons, than to have prevailed upon his friends in the House of Lords to have set this matter right, and explained the mistake into which the Members of the House of Commons had fallen: yet nothing like it appears. Lord GRENVILLE and the

Duke of NORFOLK, instead of correcting the error, if it was one, repeat it; and therefore confirm the impression (the erroneous impression Dr. MILNER would call it) which had been produced in the House of Commons.

Lord GRENVILLE is made to say by the same Reporter,—

"It is unquestionably proper that the Crown should exercise an effectual negative over the appointment of the persons called to execute those functions (meaning the Bishops). *To this effectual* power the Catholics *declare* themselves perfectly willing to *accede.*" And in his reply,—"With regard to the proposition itself, he should rather think, that, instead of presenting the names of the three persons to the King, for his Majesty to choose one of them, as had been mentioned, it would be more eligible to present but one name; and if that were rejected, another, *and so on in succession, until his Majesty's approbation should be obtained.*"

And the Duke of NORFOLK, in explaining the proposition, says, (page 686)

They (the Catholics) were disposed to lay before his Majesty a list of three persons, of whom his Majesty was to be at liberty to reject two; the remaining one would be invested with the Episcopal Dignity; but if *his Majesty were to reject the whole three, then another list of three distinct persons would be submitted to his consideration, and so on*, until his Majesty should signify his approbation of any individual, by allowing his name to remain."

Here then, without wasting more time, it appears that the same proposition of *effectual interference*, without any limitation, was repeated in the House of Lords. And, what is still more remarkable, Lord Grenville, in his reply, after having heard the Duke of Norfolk's distinct statement of the proposition, as his Grace conceived it, recommends it with some variation; but that variation is proposed as an idea of his own, what he would "rather think to be more eligible," and relates only to the manner in which the names should be proposed to his Majesty, without in any degree limiting the extent to which his Majesty might be at liberty to reject them.

It is certainly true, that great part of the weight of these observations rests upon the accuracy of the Report which Mr. Cobbett has given of these Debates; it is therefore proper to see how far it is reasonable that this Report should be relied upon. It will be necessary, however, to defer this consideration for another letter.

I am Sir, your obedient Servant, A. B.

LETTER VI.

It is admitted, in the conclusion of my last letter, that great part of the observations there made, rest upon the accuracy of the report which Mr. COBBETT has given of the debates upon the Catholic Question. It probably will be remarked, that that report is not authentic, and may be inaccurate; that Mr. COBBETT's

Register is no record, and possibly little more than a collection made from the different Newspaper reports of the same debates; and that the inaccuracy of the Newspaper reports is the continual subject of complaint. It is undoubtedly but just that every attention should be paid to this remark, because Dr. MILNER, in his letter from Cork, alludes to the inaccuracy of these Newspaper reports, denies their correctness, and complains of the manner in which they seem to have been relied upon.

"It is evident," he says, "that the writers give implicit faith to the accounts of *negligent*, *drowsy*, *tippling*, and *ignorant* reporters, concerning the late debates, which they have seen in the Newspapers. It is likewise plain that they make no allowance for *the unguarded and unwarranted expressions and arguments* of the *orators* themselves. Now, it is a fact which I can aver, as *attending the whole of the debates in both Houses*, that the speeches themselves are most incorrectly and unfaithfully published in most of the Newspapers; that the Orators themselves did not, by any means, proceed so far in their *unwarranted* concessions as they are reported to have gone; and that they made subsequent explanations of what they had actually said, of great importance, which are not at all noticed in the Newspapers. I may add, in justice to them as well as to myself, that after the debate was over, they *acknowledged themselves to have advanced certain positions, the most alarming of all that were made, for which they had no warrant but their own way of viewing the subject.*"

Now it certainly is nothing more than fair to give Dr. MILNER the full effect of this complaint, as far as it is possible; and if he has not the advantage of it to the full extent which the truth of the case would admit of, he has nobody to blame but himself; for as he was present at the whole of these debates, he might have told the public how far the Newspapers misrepresented the *unwarranted concessions* which were made; what the explanations were which corrected the first mis-statements; nay, what were *the most alarming positions* which, after the debate, the orators themselves acknowledged to Dr. MILNER, that they had made without authority. If Dr. MILNER had done this, and if, after such a statement, he had been attacked, by reference to a report of a debate, the inaccuracy of which he had corrected, he would have had good reason to complain of the unfairness of such a proceeding. But as it is, he cannot justly complain. His own statement, above alluded to, admits, that *concessions were made by the orators themselves*, which were *unwarranted*. His own statement admits that *alarming positions were advanced*, which these orators afterwards acknowledged to him, that they had advanced without his authority, and which were only founded upon their view of the subject. Why, then, did not Dr. MILNER state what those *unwarranted* concessions were? Why did he not state what those *alarming positions* were, which had been thus *confessedly advanced without his authority?* Why, the reason is obvious:—The object of Dr. MILNER was (in his

own words) "to vindicate these most distinguished and honourable characters from the foul fraud imputed to them by their political adversaries, of having proposed a plan for a certain restricted interference of the Crown, in the nomination of the Catholic Prelates of Ireland, without any warrant for this purpose;"—and if he had stated distinctly what they had proposed, and then confronted it with what he says he warranted them to propose;—if he had specified what those concessions were which (however over-stated in the Newspapers) he asserts to have been *unwarranted*, even as they were stated by the orators themselves; if he had shewn what those most alarming propositions were which, after having given them as from authority in *public* and to Parliament, they were contented to acknowledge to him in *private* to have been authorized, it is obvious that, instead of vindicating them from this charge of foul fraud, which was so imputed to them, he would, as far as his evidence would have gone, have proved and have established it against them. What allowances, therefore, may be made for the inaccuracy of the Parliamentary Reports, enough must remain, according to Dr. MILNER's own assertion, to shew that, if he is to be relied upon, his Parliamentary Advocates advanced a proposition to Parliament, as coming from the Roman Catholic Bishops, under the authority of Dr. MILNER, when Dr. MILNER says he never gave them such authority to make *any* proposition; but only ventured to *conjecture* and *presume* what would be the disposition of these Bishops upon this point; and that the proposition itself, which they advanced, contained in it concessions which he never warranted in any manner; and alarming positions which they acknowledged to him they had advanced merely upon their own views, and which he would have lost his life rather than have suffered to be adopted.

Whether, therefore, Dr. MILNER is to be believed, or whether his Parliamentary Friends are to be trusted, is the matter in dispute between them. That Dr. MILNER has not vindicated but condemned them, if he is to be relied upon, is quite clear. But it does seem a little unfortunate for the clearing up of this strange business, that Dr. MILNER, instead of stating, as it appears he has done, from recollection, what passed at these conversations, did not introduce into his letter a copy of that short printed paper which, he says, was composed by him, dated May 26, 1808, and is now in the hands of different Gentlemen.

He says, "that paper will shew that he has not *materially* varied in his present exposure, from that which he made at the time of the debates." The public would probably have been better pleased to have seen the variations which he does not deem material, and to have judged for themselves how far they were so or not. That paper, if produced, dated, as he says, on the day between the two debates, would have shewn, upon the face of it, the impression which he had of the conversation at that early period; and would have shewn that impression also, with direct reference to the misrepresentations

which had been made of his conversation by his Friends in the House of Commons.

The existence of that paper is naturally connected with some questions, which must be answered before this strange transaction can be satisfactorily explained. Did Dr. MILNER, or did he not, communicate that paper, or the contents of it, to his *Noble* Friends before the Debate in the House of Lords? If he did not, what reason can be given why, having so convenient and accurate a mode of communicating precisely what he meant to his Noble Advocates, he did not, by sending them that paper, avail himself of their assistance to correct the error into which his Friends had fallen in the House of Commons? and why he did not furnish them with those materials which would have precluded the possible repetition of the same mistake by themselves in the House of Lords? or, if he did communicate it to their Lordships, it would remain for their Lordships to vindicate themselves for their imperfect execution of an authority, which had been, with such accurate precision, intrusted to them.

The remainder of the letter in Dr. MILNER proceeds to state, not what he proposed to his Parliamentary Friends, but what he should not now object to, may well be passed over without any notice; the only object of these letters being to point out the insufficiency of the explanation which has been given, and the injustice which has been done to the Public (Roman Catholics as well as Protestants) by one or other of the parties to the declarations in question. Dr. MILNER's present statement of a proposition upon this point, with the qualifications which he thinks would render it unobjectionable, is nothing to this purpose; especially as he admits he did not give his ideas upon this subject to his Parliamentary Friends "quite so clearly and in detail as he does in his letter;" and says, also, that

"It is very possible some of the personages whom I had the honour of then communicating with, may not have fully comprehended my meaning; and I have reason to suppose that the concessions as they are here stated in this exposure, fall short of the idea which the public formed of them as they were first laid down."

Why he did not state them thus clearly, and in this detail, to his Parliamentary Friends, seeing the importance which he conceives to belong to them, it is difficult to understand; and as the concessions which he states in that exposure do, in his opinion, fall short of the idea which the public formed of them, why he let that public remain so long in ignorance of the real extent of them, is equally inconceivable.

Under a strong impression and conviction that the public have been grossly and unjustifiably imposed upon by some of the parties to this transaction, I have been desirous first of proving the fact, that such imposition was practised; and next of discovering upon whom the blame of having practised that imposition should rest. That this is no unimportant enquiry must be admitted;—for, if it

could be plainly discovered which of the parties had practised the imposition, it would at the same time be ascertained which of the parties could not again be trusted.

Whoever has taken the trouble to peruse these letters, must perceive that I have succeeded in establishing the fact, that *the public have been imposed upon;* but that I have failed in fixing the guilt of the imposition upon either party.

That a proposition was made to Parliament by some of the most distinguished Parliamentary Characters in both Houses, who distinctly stated themselves to be authorized by Dr. MILNER, as the accredited Agent of the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops, to make it in their name, is quite clear. That this proposition contained the expression of a disposition in these Prelates to make certain concessions in regard to the future elections of their Prelates, is quite clear; that Dr. MILNER has declared, that he never gave these Parliamentary Characters any authority to use the name of the Roman Catholic Bishops; that Dr. MILNER has denied that he ever authorized, either in his own name or that of the Roman Catholic Bishops, the proposal which was made;—that he has declared, that he knew that such a proposal would be schismatical and unlawful; and he would die rather than consent to it;—that the Roman Catholic Bishops themselves have declared, in full synod, that they think it inexpedient to admit of *any* alteration in the mode of electing their Bishops, and, consequently, that they have not at this time, whatever may have been their previous feeling upon the subject, the disposition to make the concessions which were offered in their name. All these propositions are quite clear. And it follows, as a necessary consequence, that whatever part of the Parliament and the public were led to believe the declarations which were made in Parliament in the name of these Prelates, have been grossly misled and imposed upon. But who is in fault among these parties remains in doubt: whether the friends of the Roman Catholics in Parliament assumed an authority which had never been reposed in them;—whether they garbled the proposition, which they were authorized to make, leaving out those qualifications and limitations which it might be thought would prevent its having the effect which they wished it to produce;—or whether Dr. MILNER assumed an authority which the Bishops never gave him; and offered a proposition, which he now feels it necessary (from observing the aversion which is felt to it among the Irish Roman Catholics) to soften, to qualify, and to recall, are questions of which the information before the public does not afford any satisfactory solution. If, indeed, it was to impute to Dr. MILNER and the generality of the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops, the principles of that Jesuitical casuistry which the Titular Roman Catholic Bishop of OSSORY has lately avowed, there would be less difficulty in the question; and the Parliamentary Advocates of the Roman Catholics would be easily acquitted of every thing but folly in relying upon Dr. MILNER.

It appears that the Titular Bishop of Ossory had promised to sign certain addresses of thanks to the persons who had taken the part of the Roman Catholics in the late debates in Parliament; and having afterwards, in breach of that promise, refused to sign them, he was charged in consequence with a breach of a *solemn* promise; and he has published what he calls a plain narrative of facts, which, he says, will complete his justification in the eyes of any impartial man. In the first place, the *plain* narrative begins with a distinction between a *serious* promise and a *solemn* promise; and he admits he made a *serious* promise; but denies having made a *solemn* one.

What the use of asserting this distinction was, unless it were to prepare the public for the casuistry which was to follow, does not clearly appear: for having admitted that he made a *serious* promise, he proceeds to admit, That he is convinced that a *serious*, *sincere*, and *voluntary* promise, binds a man who makes it, under the pain of sin, to fulfil it; and he does not defend himself for the non-performance of his promise, by alledging that it was not *seriously* or *voluntarily* made, nor even that he was not *sincere* when he made it; nor does he indeed assert that a want of sincerity on his part, at the time when he made his promise, would have justified his breaking it, although, by describing the sort of promise which he admits to be binding, by the qualification of its being sincere, as well as of its being serious and voluntary, he does give no small reason to conclude, that he thinks insincerity would be an excuse for breaking it.

Having, however, stated the sort of promise which he held to be valid, he then proceeds to state the cases in which the binding obligation of a promise ceases; and the one upon which he relies he thus explains:

"V. When, before the promise is fulfilled, the circumstances become so changed that the person promising, had he foreseen those circumstances, would never have made the promise. On this case," he says, "I rest my justification; for had I foreseen, or known, *that my signing these addresses would produce such alarm or consternation, such distike or disapprobation, as I afterwards found* they would in the minds of the great majority of the Catholic Priests and Laity in this Country, *I would by no means have consented to sign them.*

"St. Thomas says, that a man is not guilsy of an untruth in such a case, because, when he has promised, he intended to perform his promise; nor is he unfaithful to his promise, because the circumstances are changed afterwards. This is not only the opinion of St. Thomas, but is also the opinion *of all the Theologians and Canonicals I ever saw or read!* JAMES LANIGAN."

Who this ST. THOMAS is whom the Reverend Bishop quotes as his authority for this excellent piece of casuistry, I do not know; but I cannot help expressing a hope, that neither that Saint, nor

the other Theologians and Canonicals, from whom the Reverend Bishop has learnt his casuistry, are the authors whose morals are taught to the Students at Maynooth.

If we were at liberty to ascribe similar principles to Dr. MILNER and the Roman Catholic Prelates in general, undoubtedly they might say for themselves, with as good a grace as Dr. LANIGAN, that if they had known that the proposition which was to be offered in their name, through Dr. MILNER, would have created such an alarm among their flock, they would not have offered it. And it must be remembered, that Dr. MILNER, in his letter in the *Morning Chronicle*, has provided them with this excuse; for he gives one reason for the resolution of the Bishops in their Synod in these words:—

"Lastly, we find that a vast majority of our people is decidedly against the concessions, insomuch that we should lose their confidence and our influence over them were we at present to sanction it."

With Dr. LANIGAN's principles, therefore, so far from being bound by the *offer*, they would not ever have been bound had they promised to abide by it; neither would they have been bound, if, upon the faith of it, Parliament had actually granted what they requested; for I would wish to ask Dr. LANIGAN himself, Whether, if the petitions of the Roman Catholics, as presented in the last Session of Parliament, were to be granted, even on the express promise that the Petitioners should rest satisfied, and should not endeavour, by fresh petitions, to procure for their Priests and Prelates a share in the tithes, the emoluments and legal dignities of the establishment, such promise would, upon his principles, be binding, or give any ground of security to the Established Church? or, Whether, on the contrary, when upon the granting of such petitions, seats in Parliament and offices of weight and influence in the State, were opened to them, high place would not recall high thoughts? and, Whether, in the increase of their power, in the improved hope of being able to procure better terms for their Church, nay, in the nearer prospect of its re-establishment, *such an unforeseen change of circumstances would not exist* as would be sufficient, upon the Rev. Prelate's principles, to release them from the obligation of their former promise? and, Whether also this same ST. THOMAS would not be able to find in the circumstances of *prior* and *superior* obligation to the Roman Catholic Church, an additional motive for not keeping a promise, which might be then contended to have been unlawful from the beginning, from its injurious effect upon those sacred interests, which it was the primary duty of all good Roman Catholics to promote? nay, Whether such promise, made under the pain and duress (as the Lawyers would call it) of their present state of alleged persecution, would not for that reason also be held to be void? Whether ingenuity could ever fail to discover as good a reason for the breach of a promise, as that upon which Dr. LANIGAN relies for his excuse and justification? Whether, in

other words, such principles as these would not reduce the obligation of a promise to the mere convenience of performing it? And, lastly, Whether Dr. LANIGAN can possibly fail to acknowledge traits of ingenious morality congenial to his own, in the language which MILTON puts into the Great Author of all such casuistry :—

——————————"How soon
"Would height recall high thoughts! how soon unsay
"What feign'd submission swore! Ease would recant
"Vows made in pain, as impotent and void."

But it is needless to press this further; it would be unjust to fix Dr. MILNER, or the other Bishops, with Dr. LANIGAN'S principles, till they avow them; and, therefore, no assistance can be derived from Dr. LANIGAN'S Letter towards discovering the guilty author of the imposition, which has by some one been practised upon the Public.

Here then I shall close these Letters. It is no part of their object to examine the admissibility of the proposition itself, either as it appears to have been proposed to Parliament, or as Dr. MILNER now says he would be willing it should be adopted. The object of these Letters would have been best answered, if they had enabled the Public to ascertain the party upon whom the guilt of this imposition attaches; but they will have attained no immaterial point, if they shall have succeeded in shewing the insufficiency of any explanation which has as yet been given of this transaction; and, consequently, in putting the Public and Parliament upon their guard against being again so easily misled to believe what the sanguine Advocates of the Roman Catholics may venture to assert, with respect to the disposition of the Roman Catholic Bishops, or Roman Catholics in general, upon any part of this important subject.

A. B.

BIOGRAPHY.

MR. WHITAKER.

THE following brief Sketch of the Life of one of the best and most learned Members of the Church of England, which appeared originally in a provincial paper, is inserted, as a mark of respect to his memory, in a work which he often enriched by his knowledge, and adorned by his talents. Mr. Whitaker, alas! is not the only one of our co-adjutors of whom the hand of Providence has deprived us, since the first appearance of our Review. By the death of Professor Hurdis, we sustained an irreparable loss. His acute and cultivated mind supplied some of the best articles to be found in our early volumes: and, since that time, two more of our colleagues have been called "to that bourne whence no traveller

returns." It is the lot of humanity, and we bow submissive to the dispensations of Providence!

Truro, Nov. 5.

On Sunday, the 30th ult. died, at his rectory of Ruan-Lanyhorne, near Tregony, Cornwall, that great and good man, the Rev. J. Whitaker. — Mr. Whitaker was born at Manchester, about the year 1735. Of the school part of his education we know little or nothing; but we understand that he went early to Oxford, where he was elected Fellow of C.C.C., and where he discovered, in a very short time, those originalities, those peculiarities of mind, which afterwards so strongly marked him as an author and as a man. His uncommon vigour of intellect at once displayed itself among his acquaintance; but, whilst his animated conversation drew many around him, a few were repelled from the circle, by his impatience of contradiction (a failing which almost ever accompanies powers like his) and by the consciousness, it should seem, of their own inferiority. The character of his genius, however, was soon decided in literary composition. In 1771, Mr. Whitaker published his "History of Manchester *," in quarto: a work which, for acuteness of research, bold imagination, independent sentiment, and correct information, has scarcely its parallel in the literature of this country. Nor does its composition less merit our applause, whether we have respect to the arrangement of the materials, the style, or the language. In some passages, there is "supreme elegance;" in others, a magnificence of thought, a force of expression, a glow of diction, truly astonishing. The introduction of Christianity into this island, in particular, is described, we had almost said, with the pen of inspiration. With regard to the general subject of *The Manchester*, we may observe, That Mr. Whitaker was the first writer who could so light up the region of Antiquarianism, as to dissipate its obscurity, even to the eyes of ordinary spectators. The discoveries of our antiquaries, indeed, have been attended with no brilliant success; and Whitaker's *Manchester* is perhaps the only book in which the truth of our island history has been elucidated by the hand of a master. It is rather singular that this work was, in the order of merit as well as time, the first of Mr. Whitaker's publications. In proportion as our author advanced in life, his imagination seems, by a strange inversion of what is characteristic of our nature, to have gained an ascendency over his judgment; and we shall perceive more of fancy and of passion, of conjecture and hypothesis, in some of his subsequent productions, than just opinion, or deliberate investigation. Mr. Whitaker's *Genuine History of the Britons asserted*, an octavo volume, published in 1772, may be accepted as a sequel to *The Manchester*. It contains a complete refutation of "the unhappy Macpherson;" whose *Introduction to the History of*

* The first volume only, we apprehend.

Great Britain and Ireland, is full of palpable mistakes and misrepresentations.

In 1773, we find Mr. Whitaker the morning preacher of Berkeley Chapel; to which office he had been appointed by a Mr. Hughes; but, about the end of the following year, he was removed from that situation. This gave occasion to *The Case between Mr. Whitaker and Mr. Hughes, relative to the Morning Preachership of Berkeley Chapel*; in which Mr. Whitaker relates some remarkable particulars; and declares himself "unalterably determined to carry the matter into Westminster-Hall;" and, we may be assured, that he used his utmost efforts to bring his determination into action: but the fervour of his resentment threw him off his guard; and he expressed himself so indiscreetly, that his *Case* was considered as a libel by the Court of King's Bench. During his residence in London, he had an opportunity of conversing with several of our most celebrated writers; among whom were the author of *The Rambler*, and the historian of the Roman Empire. It does not appear, indeed, that Johnson was much attached to Whitaker. Equally strong in understanding, equally tenacious of opinion, and equally impassioned in conversation, it is not probable that they should amicably coalesce on all occasions. In the Ossianic controversy, they were decidedly hostile. With Gibbon, Mr. Whitaker was well acquainted; and the MS. of the first volume of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, was submitted to Mr. W.'s inspection; — but what was his surprize when, as he read the same volume in print, that chapter which has been so obnoxious to the Christian world, was then first introduced to his notice! That chapter, Gibbon had suppressed in the MS. over-awed by Mr. Whitaker's high character, and afraid of his censure; and, in fact, that the feeble Deist should have shrunk from his indignant eye, may well be conceived, when we see his Christian principle and his manly spirit uniting in the rejection of a living of considerable value, which was at this time offered him by a Unitarian patron! He spurned at the temptation, and pitied the seducer *!

Of his integrity, however, some recompense was now at hand; and, about the year 1778, he succeeded, as fellow of Corpus Christi College, to the Rectory of Ruan-Lanyhorne, in this county, one of the most valuable livings in the gift of that College †; and into this county he came, to reside upon his Rectory. Here, it might have been expected, that retirement and leisure would greatly favour the pursuits of literature; and that, though "the converser" (to use an expression of Mr. Whitaker) had disappeared, the author would break forth with new energies; but Ruan-Lanyhorne was, for several years, no tranquil seat of the Muses.

---

* On this subject, Mr. Polwhele addressed to Mr. Whitaker a Sonnet; for which, see "Sketches in Verse," second edition.

† He had proceeded to his degree of B. D.

That pleasant seclusion was now the scene of contest—but of contest which (in the opinion of the writer of this Memoir) was absolutely unavoidable. Mr. Whitaker had proposed a tythe-composition with his parishioners, by no means unreasonable. This they refused to pay: but Mr. Whitaker was steady to his purpose. A rupture ensued between the parties—the tythes were demanded in kind—disputes arose upon disputes—animosities were kindled—and litigations took place. That Mr. Whitaker was finally victorious, afforded pleasure to the friends of the Rector, and, let us add, to the friends of justice and of truth;—yet it was long before harmony was restored to Ruan-Lanyhorne. That his literary schemes had been so sadly interrupted, was the subject of general regret. But the conscientious Pastor looked with a deeper concern to the spiritual welfare of his parishioners. He saw with sorrow their aversion to his preaching—their indifference to his instructions—their repugnance to his authority,—and "he laboured more abundantly;" till, after a few years, he had the satisfaction to perceive a visible alteration in the behaviour of the principal parishioners; and a mutual good understanding was established between the Pastor and his flock. His cordial—his familiar manner, indeed, was always pleasing to those whom prejudice had not armed against him; and, in proportion as they became acquainted with his kind disposition, the transitoriness of his resentments, and, after injuries, his promptness to forgive, and anxious wish to be forgiven,—they endeavoured more and more to cultivate his friendship, and at length loved and revered him as their father. Nothing can more fully display the warmth of his affections, his zeal as a Minister of Christ, or his impassioned style of eloquence, than those *Sermons* * which he published in 1783; after having preached them to his parishioners, we doubt not with a voice and manner to penetrate the conscience, and strike conviction into the soul, to awaken the tears of penitence, and elevate the hopes of the Christian to the abodes of immortality. That he should have published so little in the line of his profession, is, perhaps, to be regretted. Though his *Origin of Arianism* be a large volume, it is a controversial tract, full of erudition and ingenious argumentation. We have read no other work of Mr. Whitaker in Divinity, except *The Real Origin of Government* (expanded into a considerable Treatise, from a Sermon which he had preached before Bishop Buller, at his Lordship's primary visitation) and *The Introduction to Flindell's Bible.*—This has been much admired as a masterly piece of eloquence.

In the mean time the Antiquary was not at rest. His *Mary Queen of Scots*, published in 1787, in three octavo volumes; his *Course of Hannibal over the Alps*,—his *Ancient Cathedral of Cornwall*,—his *Supplement to Mr. Polwhele's Antiquities of Cornwall*,—

---

* They are entitled "Sermons upon Death, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell."

his *London*, and his *Oxford* (both as yet in MS.) furnish good evidence of an imagination continually occupied in pursuits which kindled up its brightest flame, though not always of that judgment, discretion, or candour, which, if human characters had been ever perfect, we should have expected from a Whitaker.

In criticism, however (where writing anonymously, he would probably have written as temper or caprice suggested) we find him, for the most part, candid and good-natured—not sparing of censure, nor yet lavish of applause—and affording us, in numerous instances, the most agreeable proofs of genuine benevolence. Even in the instance of Gibbon*, where he has been thought severe beyond all former example, we have a large mixture of the sweet with bitterness. It was the *critique* on Gibbon that contributed greatly to the reputation of *The English Review*, in which Mr. Whitaker was the author of many valuable articles. To his pen also, *The British Critic* and *The Antijacobin Review* were indebted for various pieces of criticism.

But the strength of his principles is nowhere more apparent than in those articles where he comes forward, armed with the panoply of truth, in defence of our Civil and Ecclesiastical Constitution. It was there he struck his adversaries with consternation; and we beheld the host of Jacobins shrinking away from before his face, and creeping into their caverns of darkness.—But we are here, perhaps, betrayed into expressions too violent for plain prose, which reminds us of another part of our friend's literary character,—we mean his Poetical Genius. That he contributed some fine pieces of poetry to *The Cornwall and Devon Poets*, is well known. These were published in two small octavo volumes; and the Editor has now in his possession a sufficient quantity of good verse, by Mr. Whitaker, to fill forty or fifty pages of a third volume, now in contemplation.

We have thus (with rapid glances, and in a manner too desultory to be perfectly satisfactory to ourselves) reviewed the productions of our old and valued friend; and hailed him in the several departments of the Historian, the Theologist, the Critic, the Politician, and the Poet. Versatility, like Whitaker's, is, in truth, of rare occurrence; but still more rare is the splendor of original genius, exhibited in walks so various: not that Mr. Whitaker was equally happy in them all. His characteristic traits as a writer, were acute discernment, and a velocity of ideas which acquired new force in composition, and a power of combining images in a manner peculiarly striking, and of flinging on every topic of discussion the strongest illustration. With little scruple, therefore, we hazard an opinion, That though his chief excellence be recognized in antiquarian research, he would have risen to higher emi-

---

* Whitaker's Review of Gibbon's History (vols. iv. v. and vi.) originally appeared in The English Review.

nence as a poet, had he cultivated in early youth the favour of the Muses. Be this, however, as it may, there are none who will deem us extravagant in pronouncing, That Mr. Whitaker was a GREAT literary character.

That he was GOOD as well as great, would sufficiently appear in the recollection of any period of his life, whether we saw him abandoning preferment from principle, and heard him "reasoning of righteousness and judgment to come," until a Gibbon trembled; or whether, amongst his parishioners, we witnessrd his unaffected earnestness of preaching, his humility in conversing with the poorest cottagers, his sincerity in assisting them with advice, his tenderness in offering them consolation, and his charity in relieving their distresses. It is true, to the same warmth of temper, together with a sense of good intentions, we must attribute an irritability at times destructive of social comfort, an impetuousness that brooked not opposition, and bore down all before it. This precipitation was in part also to be traced to his ignorance of the world,—to his simplicity in believing others like himself,—precisely what they seemed to be,—and on the detection of his error, his anger at dissimulation or hypocrisy. But his general good humour, his hospitality, and his convivial pleasantry, were surely enough to atone for those sudden bursts of passion, those flashes which betrayed his "human frailty," but still argued genius. And they who knew how "fearfully and wonderfully he was made," could bear from a Whitaker what they could not so well have tolerated in another. In his family, Mr. Whitaker was uniformly regular: nor did he suffer at any time his literary cares to trench on his domestic duties. The loss of such a man must be deemed, as it were, a chasm both in public and in private life. But, for the latter, we may truly say, that if ever wife had cause to lament the kind and faithful husband, or * children the affectionate parent, or servants the indulgent master, the family at Ruan-Lanyhorne must feel their loss irreparable. +

Such was the Historian of Manchester and the Rector of Ruan-Lanyhorne, of whom we have given a very hasty sketch—we hope, however, a just and impartial one. That he should have lived to the age of seventy-three is rather to be wondered; for, strong as was his bodily constitution, his mind, ever active and restless, must have worn out (we should have presumed) even that athletic frame, long before the period assigned to man's existence. Amidst his ardent and indefatigable researches into the Antiquities of London, his friends detected the first symptoms of bodily decay. His journey to London, his vast exertions there in procuring information, his energetic and various conversation with literary characters, brought on a debility which he little regarded, till it alarmed him in a stroke of paralysis. From this he never recovered to such a degree as to

---

* Two amiable daughters.

\+ Mrs. Whitaker was a Miss Tregenna, of an ancient Cornish family.

be able to resume, with any good effect, his studies or occupations But, for the last year, his decline has been gradual; and it was such as we have contemplated with pleasure, since we have seen him sensible of his approaching dissolution, yet invariably supported by the faith of a Christian. His indeed was the resignation, the cheerfulness becoming a primitive disciple of that Jesus, in whose mercies he reposed, and to whom only he looked for acceptance. And he who would derive comfort from the prospect of death, should keep in view our venerable friend, when, at that awful hour which assured us of his happiness, at peace with himself, his fellow-creatures, and his God, he sunk as into quiet slumber, without a trouble or a pain,—and, with a smile on his countenance, expired.

The Isle of the Ocean is Tyranny's Foe.

I.

When the Sons of a Frederick at France were dismay'd,
And the Princes of Prussia their Country betray'd;
When the armies of Austria reluctantly fled,
And abandon'd to Frenchmen the soil where they bled;
When Portugal's Prince sought Brazil's peaceful shore;
And the Patriot Swiss sung his War song no more,
This Hope caus'd each bosom with freedom to glow,
That the Isle of the Ocean was Tyranny's Foe.

II.

When France and Oppression base Europe enslav'd,
Spain, bursting her shackles, French treachery brav'd;
Yet mindful lest *Fury all order* should blast,
Nail'd *Royalty's Standard* to *Liberty's Mast.*
Then *Britain* eclipsing the glory of *Rome*,
Re-echo'd the *Mandate*, "Brave Spaniards Strike Home,"
And proclaims to the World as she seconds the Blow,
That the Isle of the Ocean is Tyranny's Foe.

III.

Resistless to *Faction* and *Slavery's Yoke*,
The *True Briton's Heart*'s like the Heart of his Oak:
Though its *Leaves* may be *shiver'd*, *unshatter'd* the *Stem*,
His love to his Monarch is the Crown's brightest gem.
Then may Victory crown our Brave Troops on the plain;
And the Conqu'ror's of Europe be conquer'd again!
While our *Tars on the Billows* teach Frenchmen to know
That the Isle of the Ocean is Tyranny's Foe!

December, 1808. S. B. Frome.

ERRATA

Page Lines

314, 5 from the bottom, insert *in* after manner
315, 12, *for* combined, *read* contained
22, *for* heir, *read* hero
316, 2, *for* their, *read* the
7, *for* adapted, *read* adopted
12, *after* event, *dele* of
28, *after* still, *insert* he
317, 23, *for* some of these, *read* none of those
6 from the bottom, *for* proofs, *read* proof.
318, 19, *for* arbicles, *read* article
27, *for* Cavallos, *read* Cevallos
33, *after* character, *insert* and
319, 13, *for* commotion, *read* conviction
320, 26, *for* in, *read* to
27, *for* brought, *read* reduced
321, 4 from the bottom, *for* must, *read* may; and *after* have, *insert* ordered
322, 2, *for* natural, *read* rational
8, *for* and, *read* now
20, *for* throws, *read* throw
23, *for* decline, *read* declare
323, 29, *for* retarding, *read* declining
last line, *for* began, *read* begun
325, 10, *for* jurisdictions, *read* jurisdiction
327, 9, *after* true, *insert* and
13, *for* on, *read* to; and *for* requisition, *read* negociation
338, 3 from the bottom, *for* relieving, *read* correcting
337, 12, from the bottom, *for* pleased, *read* placed

☞ *The Index, Table of Contents, Title-Page, &c. to Vol. XXXI, will be given with the Appendix to Vol. XXXII.*

INDEX

TO THE REMARABLE PASSAGES IN VOL. XXXI.

To find any particular Book or Pamphlet, see TABLE of CONTENTS annexed to this Volume.

ABEL, his divine belief considered, 213; important lesson taught by him to the world, 214; contrast between his character and that of Cain, 215

Abrantes, Duke of, conduct of the English commanders in Portugal considered in acknowledging the title of, in the person of Junot, 78

Accum, Mr., remarks on his Manual of Analytical Mineralogy, 309

Address, observations on his majesty's answer to that of the city of London on the convention in Portugal, 314

Agriculturists, attempt to resist the distillation from sugar, 358

Albigenses, conduct of the pope (Innocent III.) in the war against them, 384; remark on their history and religious principles, 386

Algarrabos or carob tree described, 178

Almogavares, a sort of moorish soldiers in Spain; description of their singular mode of fighting, 243

Alpargatas, or Spanish sandals; construction of, described, 178

America, remark on some important proposals submitted by a celebrated public character in, to this country, 326

Ancient ballads, by a Lady, contents of, 57; their merits, 58

Angus, Mr. introduction to his Vocabulary and to Fulton's Dictionary, 206; merit of the work, ibid.

Anonymous criticisms, observation on the importance of to literary Study, 26

Antiquarian and topographical Cabinet, observations on, 198; interesting account of Mr. Scott's Grotto at Amwell, ibid.

Argyles, institution so called, description of the plan of, 288

Armada, the invincible one, sent against this country by Philip of Spain, 372

Artists, their complaints of a want of encouragement from the British public, 231; useful recommendations to, ibid.

Austin, St., his opinion of the wickedness of schism, 330

Austria, remarks on her policy at the present critical moment, 320

BAKU, delightful country of, on the banks of the Caspian Sea, 268

Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, his mission into Wales, 6; his route described, 12; humorous remark of, 125

Bardic system, object and principle of, 132; the subsequent corruption of, ibid.

Bards among the ancient Britons, 130, 131; their periodical meetings, 131; description of their theology, 132; their provincial chair at Glamorgan, and the last of their conventions there, 133

Barrow, Mr., his life of Earl Macartney, 339; contents of, 343; important sentiments of, 348

Beaver, existence of, in Wales, in the days of Archbishop Baldwin, 123

Beauty, diversity of opinion respecting, 197

Benefit societies, general utility of, 414; baneful perversion of this species of institution in the metropolis, with the causes thereof, ibid.

Bentham, Mr., his reform of the administration of justice in Scotland, 113; merits of the author, 116; his answers to objections against his system, 119; merits of the work, 120; inelegance of his style, ibid.

Bichât, anatomical system of, described, 39

Biographers, general vindication of them from the charge of partiality, 337; qualities necessary to, 339
Blair, Mr., his grammar of natural and experimental philosophy, 59; his plan considered, ibid.
Blair's grave, its low imagery, 225
Blake, Mr., his original designs for Blair's grave, 225; passages from his advertisement, 226; Mr. Fuseli's address respecting, ibid.; his figure of Christ descending into the grave, 228; his descent of man into the vale of death, ibid.; other designs of, from various passages, 230; character of those designs, 233; his portrait of, ibid.; his dedication and poetical merits, 234
Bland, Rev. Robert, on his Edwy and Elgiva and Sir Everard, 142; detail of historical facts on which those tales are founded, 143; interesting opening of the poem, 144; description of the incidents of the piece, ibid., 145, 146, 147, 148, 149; interesting merits of his poetry, 149; his translations from Euripides and Sophocles, 150
Boissy d'Anglas, president of the national convention, singular anecdote of, 361
Bosveld, Mr.; his commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, 367
Bonifaza in Valencia described, 169
Borringdon, Lord, report of the proceedings against Sir A. Paget; observations on Lady Borringdon's letters, 212
Bounties, remarks on the impolicy of granting them on the importation of grain, 366
Britton, Mr., his catalogue of the pictures belonging to the Marquis of Stafford, 199; refutation of his reasons for not exposing picture galleries to the observation of the public, ibid.; character of the British public vindicated, 200; utility of the catalogue, 201
Buonaparte, his reinforcements sent for the subjection of Spain, 326; firm conduct of our government respecting his late overtures, 431; his hatred of literature, and his efforts to destroy all learned institutions, 349
Burn's Poems, the effect of their popularity, 504
Burrard, Sir H., his conduct on assuming the command of the British army in Portugal, 323; his own culpability admitted by himself, 424; the grounds on which he has endeavoured to excuse his conduct, 425; singular effects produced in him by his appointment to the chief command in Portugal, 426; circumstance in favour of, 432
CÆPIO, see Viriatus
Caerleon, town of, 14; remark on its etymology, 16
Cæsar, Julius, his military operations in Britain, 8
Cambridge, Rev. G. O., sermon preached by him to the clergy of the archdeaconry of Middlesex, 413; judicious observations on the growth of sectarism, ibid.
Campbell, Duncan, Esq., observations on his trial at Wells, 90; the case stated, 91; severity of his sentence, ibid.; his conduct justified, ibid, 92; opinion of Lord Hale as applicable to the case, 92; observations of the judge, ibid, 94; justification of Mr. Campbell's conduct, 94; evil consequences of his conviction considered in a public and moral view, 95
Carr, Sir John, his action against Hood and Sharpe for a libel, 19; great importance of the verdict to the liberty of the press, ibid.; opinions of the Lord Chief Justice on that occasion, 20; excellent sentiments expressed by him in the course of the trial, 21; his summing up thereon, 22; importance of the trial, ibid.
Carter, his architectural knowledge, 134
Castellon de la plana in Valencia, its great fertility and immense population of, 171
Catholic sees in Ireland, mode of filling the vacant ones, 493
Caucasus, mountains of, 258; numerous tribes which inhabit them, 259; divisions and various names of, 260; climate of, 263; civil history of, ibid.; interesting history of the moral and domestic economy of the inhabitants of, 264; their singular marriage ceremonies, 265; their ferocious habits, 266; striking similarity between a governor among them and Buonaparte, 267
Censure, exercise of vindicated, 97; application of to the conduct of private individuals, ibid.
Cevallos, secretary, great importance

of his exposure of the conduct of the Corsican towards Spain, 318; effect produced by it on the minds of the Spanish people, 319
Chelmsford, probability of its having been a Roman fortress, 9
Christians, parties into which the whole body of in England may be divided, 87; character of the war between them and the Moors in Spain, 163
Church, on the origin of the, 323
Cid Rodrigo Dias, the famous Campeador, history of his origin, 236; extravagant exploits attributed to him, 237; ridiculous story of him and a leper, with Mr. Southey's remarks, 238
Clarendon, Lord, his description of the members of the two houses of Parliament, 393
Coffee recommended as a substitute for malt liquors, 363
Collins, Mr., his Ready Reckoner, 211
Convention. See Dalrymple
Copenhagen, justice and policy of the expedition to, vindicated, 183
Corinna, remark on the novel of, 278
Cornea of the eye, structure of, 39; treatment of in inflammation, 40; fleshy excrescences of, ibid; its pustules or small tumors, with their probable cause, 41; abscess of, ibid.; ulcers of, 42; effects of wounds and of foreign bodies on, 43; speck of, 44
Corruption and Intolerance, infatuation of the author of two poems so called, 308
Costume, importance of, in painting, 197
Cotton, Admiral, naval convention signed by him at Lisbon, 79; his authority to enter into that convention questioned, ibid.
Courts of civil judicature, advantages of an increase in the number of, 118
Crabb, on the expediency of publishing an improved dictionary of the English language, 98; plan proposed by him, ibid.
Critical Reviewers, danger of their principles to church and state, 62; extravagant egotism of, ibid.; specimens of their palpable inconsistency relating to British maritime rights, 63; another with respect to the origin of the French revolution, ibid.; their opinions on that event, and on the characters of Necker, Talleyrand, and Buonaparte, 64, 65, 66; cause falsely assigned by them for the mischiefs and calamities of that revolution, 66; instance of their inconsistency on theological subjects, 67; opinion of, on the writings of St. Paul, ibid; pretended neutrality of, in matters of religion, 68; their opinion on the Catholic claims, ibid.; on the thirty-nine articles, 69, 70; on the doctrine of original sin, 70, 71; observations of, on Mr. Robinson's principles and writings, 71, 72, 73; general observation on their unparallelled inconsistency and impudence, 73
Cromlech at Pentre Evan in Wales, 123
Crosby's Merchant's and Tradesmen's Dictionary, utility of, 212
Cross, origin of the assumption of, 123
Curwen, Mr., his hints on the economy of feeding stock and bettering the condition of the poor, 358; substitution of potatoes for hay in feeding horses, 359; his manner of supplying milk to the poor, 360; on the subject of friendly societies, 367; merits of his work, ibid.
D'AIGALLIERS, Monsr., some account of his life and character, 362
Dalrymple, Sir Hew, his disgraceful convention in Portugal, 74; effect produced by his arrival in the British army, 75; the different articles of his convention and of the suspension considered, 77, 78, 79; plea of ignorance offered by him in his defence, 80; conduct which he ought to have adopted, 81; his reasons for the convention refuted, 82; dishonourable character of the convention, ibid.; probable cause of his appointment to the command in Portugal, 85; degree of blame imputable to the person who appointed him, 316; his conduct, 322; real question on the subject, as it affects him, 323; the confession of Sir H. Burrard diminishes his guilt, 427; whom the blame of appointing them to commands in Portugal attaches, ibid.
David, St., patron of Wales, 121; cathedral of, and incredible amount of offerings at its shrine in the days of popery, ibid.
Defenders, a popish banditti in Ireland, profligate and outrageous, 278
Defrichemens, definition of the word, 357
Derberd, a city in the mountains of

Caucasus, description of, with its inhabitants, 268; great dread in which the gate of is held by the Turks, ibid.
D'Escury, Mr., Remark on his Latin verses, 369; extract of one on the vaccine discovery, ibid.
Dissentions in Religion, their direct opposition to the injunctions in holy Writ, 86; period from which the origin of may be dated, 329
Dissenters, strong exhortation to the conscientious among them, 90; singular presumption and audacityof two of their preachers, 333; circumstance favourable to them, ibid.; the correction of their abuses recommended to the heads of the church, 334
Don, origin of the Spanish title of, 235
Dress, modern distinctions of, contrasted with those of former times, 277
Druids and Ovates among the Britons, description of, 131
Duchess of York, singular dedication to, 275
ECCLESIASTICAL property, how it was derived, 439
Economy of certain vegetables, 404
Edinburgh Review, the disloyal principles of the writers of, and of the Annual Review, 61; iniquitous practice resorted to by them in reviewing publications, ibid.
Elizabeth, Queen of England, her spirited conduct towards Pope Pius IV.
Enfield, Mr., merits of his Pronouncing Dictionary, 59
Englishmen, their ignorance of the more remote periods of their own history, 142
Erfurth, excellent jeu d'esprit on the meeting of the two emperors there, 324; probable object of Buonaparte in his proposal after that meeting, to this country, 320
Essex, public meeting there, on the convention in Portugal, 325; the different persons composing it, 326
Evidence, the English law of, very defective, 118; mode suggested for its amendment, ibid.
Europe, review of the political state of, 213
Exhortation, earnest one, to the bishops and established clergy on the subject of a gross abuse of the spiritual office, 285
FABRICIUS, his system of entomology, 140
Faculty of dispensation for a plurality, form of a, 440
Fashion, vast importance of, in the opinion of a certain female writer, 276
Fashionable world, great disorder in, during the pending of a cause relating to it before the chancellor, 288
Fermentation, the impolicy of adopting it in the making of bread, 364
Finland, armistice concluded in, between Sweden and Russia, 321; remark on Buonaparte respecting, ibid.
Fischer, C. A., history of Valencia, 168; merits of Shoberl's translation, 181
Fiske, Mrs., her character, 274; humorous description of her "Records of Fashion," ibid.; her remarks on the subject of dress making, 277; her history of the fashionable tiara, 284; of the shawl and glove, 285; the fan, shoes, stockings, and Roman sandal, 287; origin of the garter, 289; fair travellers noticed in her general view of female costume, 290; Copenhagen expedition as connected with the fashions, 291; her description of a veil, 292; her remark on genius, ibid.; subject of wigs, ibid.; her excellent description of a lady's hands and feet, ibid.; her work strongly recommended to the Bond-street sages, ibid.
Flemings, singular knowledge formerly attributed to those who were settled in Pembrokeshire, 17
Forsythe, Mr., vindication of his method of plastering wounds in trees, 400
Fourcroy, Mons., 279; humorous remarks on his history of lemon juice, ibid.; remarks on his chemical experiments on the milts of fishes, 354
French dominion, prevalence of, intimately connected with that of the French language, 209
French language, frequent use of, a great political and moral evil, 224
French Justice, instance of the true character of, 368
French quacks, their superiority over the English, 368
GANDIA, district and town of, in Valencia, description of, 172
Garrow, Mr., immoral expressions used by him on a crim. con. trial, 99; serious consequences to be apprehended from the encouragement of such conduct among counsellors, ibid.
Giraldus de Barri, his birth, family, and early acquirements, 3; anecdote descriptive of his inflexibility

in supporting the interests of the church, ibid., 4; his endeavours to enforce celibacy among the clergy, ibid.; Henry the Second's opposition to his being elected Bishop of St. David's, ibid.; prodigious fame acquired by him in Paris, 5; reflexions of, on the luxurious living of the monks, ibid.; appointed administrator of the church and deputed pacificator to Wales, ibid.; goes to Ireland, ibid.; his two works, "De Topographia Hiberniæ," and "De Expugnatione Hiberniæ," ibid.; embarks in the crusade with Archbishop Baldwin, 6; appointed by Richard the First coadjutor in in the regency, ibid.; singular conversation with, feigned by a mad priest, ibid.; retires to Lincoln, 7; letter written by him to Archbishop Baldwin, ibid.; ineffectual efforts of, to succeed to the see of St. David's, ibid.; retires into Wales and dies there, 8; his character, ibid.; his characters of Henry the Second and Richard the First, 11; division of his itinerary, ibid.; his strong passion for the marvellous, ibid.; enumeration of the miraculous stories contained in his descriptions, 12; one of the more humorous, 13; his unworthy opinion of the fair sex, 14; specimen of his style, 14; miraculous story related by him of a boy, 17; his description of Manorbeer Castle, 18; his account of some trees discovered under Nirvegal sands, ibid.; another singular miracle of a woman at Aberteivi, 122; his wonderful history of the beaver, 124; another of two lakes in the mountain of Snowdon, 125; singular anecdote related by him of a Jew, 127

Glove, remark on the ancient custom of throwing the, on the election of the lord mayor of London, 286

Gospel of St. Matthew, answer to a Socinian objection to the authenticity of, 440; authority of Pliny quoted in refutation of that objection, 441; observations respecting the date of, 442

Graham, I., his poem called "The Siege of Copenhagen," 183

Graham, Rev. I., his sermon on the utility of female benefit societies, 414

Grao, a port near Valencia, 178

Griolet, M., panegyric on, 360; account of his character, 361

HALLE, singular cases of vaccination, 353

Heathen morality, observation respecting, 54

Hebrew tongue, peculiar genius of considered, 256

Henry, Dr., reason why his history of England is generally commended, 408

Heresy, the true meaning of the term considered, 88; perverse application of by the papists, 89

Hippisley, Sir J. C., his pamphlet on the Catholic Question, 368

Hoare, C. I., his prize poem on the shipwreck of St. Paul, 46; beautiful extract from, 47

Hoare, Sir Richard C., Bart., just encomium on his character, 1; his translation of Giraldus de Barri's Itinerary of Bishop Baldwin, 2; his preface, ibid.; his introduction to the "History of Cambria," 8; his Roman Geography of Britain, 10; account of the public works of the Romans in England, ibid.; description of the various crusades against the Saracens, 13; his style, 14; different classes of castles in Wales described by him, 131; his opinion on the origin of Saxon architecture, 134; want of precision in his distinction between Saxon and Norman architecture, 135; his style, and the merits of the engravings in his work, 137

Hodgson and Dougall, Messrs., observations on their Cabinet of the Arts, 195; the author's remarks on expression, 196; favourable remarks on the merits of the work, 198

Hodgson, Rev. Christopher, his tract on the being and existence of God, 206; admirable arguments of, to prove the existence of a first cause, ibid.; the existence of the Creator evinced by his works, 208

Home, considered as a subject for poetic talent, 185; a poem so called, ibid.; remark on the author's panegyrics, 191; merits of the poem, 192

House of Lords, on the late alterations in, 134

Howard, Nathaniel, his Greek and English vocabulary, 310

Hugonets, dreadful massacre of at Paris, 388; great rejoicings at Rome in consequence of that event, ibid.

Human eye, authors who have written on the diseases of, 38; enumeration of those diseases, 39

Hunter, Mr. J., his ingenious physiological theories, 39
IBERIA, in Asia, supposed derivation of its name, 271
Jefferson, Mr., his message to the American Congress, 432
India, impolicy of the system of supporting the petty native princes there, 348
Inquiry, court of, public meetings since its institution, on the subject of the convention in Portugal, 323; general nature of such a court, 324; radical defect in our military jurisprudence respecting, with hints for an amendment, 325
Inquisition, account of the, 389; diabolical hypocrisy attending the execution of its sentence, ibid.
Inscription, curious one, in the court-yard of the Barberini palace at Rome, 9; remarkable observation of the prince of Wales on, ibid.
John Bull, report of his interesting trial and acquittal, 318
John Huss and Jerome of Prague, circumstances attending their execution as heretics, 388
Joyce, Rev. Mr., his system of practical arithmetic, 205
Irish rebellion in 1641, account of the plan and organization of, 393; hardened audacity of some of the leaders in, after the Restoration, 395
Irwin, Mr., remarks on his ode to Iberia, 417; patriotic effusion of, 418
LANCASTER, Mr. See Religious
Lateran Decree, passed by the fourth council, for deposing princes and absolving their subjects from their allegiance, 384
Latin language, expediency of making it the general diplomatic language, 209
Laws, importance of, when well balanced, 113; progress of, 114; necessity of their being adapted to the manners and condition of the people to be ruled by them, ibid.; pernicious tendency of the many technical proceedings in those of England, 117; natural mode of proceeding in, explained and recommended, ibid.
Learning better than House and Land, Dr. Carey's, character of the author, 311
Lee, Mrs., vindication of her conduct to the Gordons, 59; the depth of her intellectual powers, 60; her innocence evident to those acquainted with human nature, ib.
Legislature, right of, to interfere in the regulation of the possession and enjoyment of ecclesiastical property, 438
Leland, the antiquary, excellence of his descriptions vindicated, 17
Lenoir, M., his "Ode Pindarique, &c." 57; stanza from, ibid.; further remark of, 205; his method of French spelling, ibid.
Lesghaes, a race of people in the mountains of Caucasus, description of their warlike character, 269
Letter to Mr. Cobbett, 22; to the editor, 60; to the Rev. Dr. L., 85; to the editor, 90, 96, 98, 99; to the Rev. Dr. L., 213; to the editor, 219; To the editor of the Satirist, 222, 333, 334, 433; to the Rev. Dr. Mansel, ibid. 390; to the editor of the Antijacobin, 440, 443; to the editor of the Dublin Journal, 491; to the editor, 500, 504, 508, 513, 517, 522
Llhevelyn ap Gruffyth, last prince of the Welsh, 11
Liberty of the press, vast importance of in a political point of view, 21; true meaning of the term, 90
Linné, decided superiority of his Systema Naturæ, 34
Lionetto, Senor, the incombustible man; his handling red-hot iron, 366
Locke, Mr., his plan of educating children, 30
Locusts, similarity between the manner of their appearance in Spain and that of the French in the same country, 104
MACARTNEY, Earl, eulogium on his character, 339; his conduct in India, 340; his family, 342; introduction to the Empress Catherine, 344; important treaty negociated by him with Russia, ibid.; his successful labours in the Irish Parliament, 345; happy effects of his government in Granada, ibid.; appointed president of Madras, 346; difficulties experienced by him in his government there, 347; immense bribe offered to and rejected by him, 348; attacks made on him by Hastings and others, ibid.
Macartney, Rev. Dr., his exemplary conduct in Ireland during the rebellion there, 342
Mahommed, remarks on his doctrines, 154; striking similarity between him and Buonaparte, 157
Malcolm, Mr., his anecdotes of the man

ners and customs of London during the eighteenth century, 407; his mode of dividing his subject censured, ibid.; contents of his chapters and remarks on his selection, 409; his picture of the persons of the Londonners, 410

Manorbeer Castle. See Giraldus de Barri

Marechal de Tesse, his life and character, 363; strange mixture of contrarieties, 365

Marriage state, interesting and useful lesson on the duties of, 165

Matter, considered as an effect and not a cause of ulceration, 42

Mavor, Mr., "a circle of the arts and sciences," 58

Mayne, Mr., his "Siller gun," 304; subject of the poem, 305; interesting extracts from, 295; character of the author and of the poem

Medical students, useful and able essay addressed to them, on the importance and utility of the profession, 202; interesting hint contained therein, ibid.

Melancthon, tendency of his letters on the conduct of the clergy reprobated, 222

Memoirs of the class of mathematical and physical sciences in the French National Institute, merits of, 349
articles contained in, 351

Merit, necessity for its being made the sole motive of preference in the British army, 84

Milk, great virtues of as a diet considered, 361

Milner, Dr., his examination of an article in the Antijacobin Review on the catholic question, 368; his assertions respecting the loyalty of the Catholics in Queen Elizabeth's reign, 369; his opinion of the traitors who then suffered, 373; blasphemous note subjoined by him, ibid.; singular grounds on which he justifies the conduct of those rebels, ibid.; his opinion and real sentiments of popery, 374; refutation of his assertion respecting Lord Burleigh, 375; instance of his disregard to historic truth, ibid.; false assertion of, respecting the editors of the Antijacobin, 377; his pamphlet, ibid.; his motives in publishing it, ibid.; his attempt to excuse the doctrines of the general councils, 379; blasphemous assertion of, 380; his opinion of the different councils, 381; intolerance of his principles instanced, 386; assertion respecting the loyalty of the Irish Catholics, refuted, 387; his work called the Christian philosopher, 390; virulent libels contained in his Tour through Ireland, 391; his gross perversion of historical truth in attempting to palliate the Irish rebellion in 1641, 392; his assertion that the pope has no legal right to temporal honour, refuted, 396; miracle recorded by him, ibid.; letter inserted by him in the Dublin Journal, 491; letters in reply thereto, 500, 504, 508, 513, 527, 522

Ministers, their opinion on the late Portuguese convention and the measure to be adopted by them in consequence, 83; their great exertions of, in behalf of Spain, 429

Ministry, favourable change to be expected from the admission of certain eminent characters into the, 428

Monthly, Critical, and Analytical Reviews, bad principles of, 61

Moors. See Southey

Morton, Rev. I., sermon preached by him at Bedford at the visitation of the clergy, 53; on the divine origin of the clergy, 54; on the profligacy of the age, ibid.; danger to which the established church stands exposed, 55

Mountnorris, Earl of, his evidence on Sir John Carr's trial, 21; just comment of the attorney-general thereon, ibid.

Murray, Mr., his reply to Highmore's objections to the bill for the prevention of small-pox infection, 310

"My Pocket Book," wit and humour of, 19; excellent criticism contained in, against Sir John Carr's "Stranger in Ireland," 21; letter from the author of, to Mr. Cobbett, respecting Sir Richard Phillips, with remarks thereon, 23

NAKED FIGURE, cause of the frequent display of, among painters, 197

Narration, a dreadful one, 411

Natural History, moral and political advantages resulting from the study of, 34; importance of, to the agriculturist, artist, and manufacturer, 37; great repute in which it is held in Sweden, 399

Natural Science, exemplification of its benefits in the improvement of the arts, 398

Navarre, singular cause of the foundation of the kingdom of, 161
Neri, Mrs., her Hour of Trial, a tale, 192; object of the author, ibid.; censure on the termination of the history, 193; characters and specimen of the author's style, 194
Nismes, Transactions of the Academy of, 355
Northumberland, Earl of, his rebellion in conjunction with the Earl of Westmoreland in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, 370
OATHS, want of due solemnity in the administration of, 99; more becoming mode of administering them recommended, ibid.
Observations on a collection of modern and contemporary voyages and travels, 422
Old Nick's Pocket Book, publication so called, 311
O'Neil, Earl of Ulster, some account of his rebellion and of the conduct of the Irish papists on that occaison, 374
Ophthalmia. different descriptions of that disorder pointed out, 203
Ossory, singular doctrines broached by the titular Bishop of, 498
Ovates. See Druids
Owen, Rev. Mr., sermon preached at Fulham, with a narration of the events which gave rise to it, 417
Owen de Cyfeilloc, a Welsh prince, account of, 126; his poetical productions, ib.
PAINTERS, their science a necessary knowledge for all classes of mankind, 196; their extreme licentiousness in their pictures, 198
Passions, their various effects in the countenance, 196; charming effect of them on the female face, ib.
Patriarchs, character of described, 327
Perceval, Mr., letter of, to Dr. Mansel on the curate's bill, 433; its object, 434; detail of the methods by which it will operate, and objections to the measure, ibid.; conclusion, 190
Philalethes, reply to the letter of, 111
Philippine grossbeak, singularity of its modification and habits described, 37
Phillips, Sir Richard, his conduct as a witness, 21; remark of the attorney general on his evidence, ibid.; unfairness of his criticisms, 24; his letter to Mr. Mainwaring, 27; his conduct respecting a publication entituled, "Travels through Spain and part of Portugal," 49, 52; wonderful invention for which mankind is indebted to him, 273; his system of biography, 273
Pickering, Mr., his speech in the American Senate, 369; insertion of the whole of that important speech, on the British Orders in Council, 370
Pinder Minimus, his Little Odes to Great Folks, 351; characters to whom they are addressed, ibid.; specimen of two of those odes, 352; his attack on sacred characters, 354; author's muse, 357
Piper, Mr., a discourse delivered by him called Christian Liberty advocated, 55; gross ignorance and presumption evinced by him, ibid.; impious remark of, respecting the Trinity, 56; fulsome panegyric of, on Mr. F. Stone, ibid.
Pistols, in what cases peace officers are justifiable in carrying them, 92
Pitman, his extracts from different Latin poets, 204; just observation of, on the works of Propertius, ibid. utility of the work, ibid.
Pius V., various conspiracies, assassinations, &c., produced by his bull against the government and life of Queen Elizabeth, 369
Platypus anatinus, a singular animal, natural history of, 138
Plautius, campaign of, in Britain, 9
Polygamy, fatal effects of, on eastern nations, 155; the cause of despotism, 156
Popish superstition, singular instance of, 240
Popish priests, unfortunate situation in which they are sometimes placed, 368; canonical oath by which they are bound, 383
Porson, Dr., history of the life of, 419; anecdotes respecting, ibid., 420, 421
Portugal, infamous character and conduct of the French troops in, 82; disgraceful convention in, 313; conduct of All the Talents as to that measure, 315
Pott, Rev. J. H., charge delivered by him to the archdeaconry of St. Alban's on religious education, 27; his refutation of an assertion of Mr Lancaster, 28; his observations on the fanciful system of Rousseau, 29; its consequences pointed out, 30; beneficial effects of a religious

education, 33; merit of this charge, 34
Power, remarkable instance of a drunken rage for, 159
Prado at Madrid, description of, 50; singular custom among the visitors there, 51
Priestley, Dr., remark respecting, 87; his great freedom in thinking and writing considered, 88
Public characters, specimens of, with remark on the character of the author, 271; on the art of writing the lives of, 272
Pulpit, propriety of personal reprehensions from, 97
Puritan, singular reply of an old reformer to one, 281
QUESTION, important one respecting satire and censuring our neighbours, 96
Reineggs, Dr., author of travels to Mount Caucasus, life of, 259; his geological account of those mountains, 261
Religious education, vast importance of, 27; mischievous system of Mr. Lancaster, 28; necessity of, in young minds, ibid.
Religious liberty, what it is, 88
Religious sects, infinite number of, 89
Reputation, importance of to the female sex, 31
Residence of the clergy, proved to be required by the canon, common, and statute law, 437
Revelation, probable causes of the obscurity in which the important doctrines of are involved, 254
Revolutions, character and effects of, in Mahomedan nations, 156
Richard I., singular anecdote of, 14
Roscoe, Mr., friendly admonition to, 356
Rousseau, merits of his system of education, 29; decided preference given to it in the English Encyclopædia, ibid.; two families who brought up their children according to his principles, with the consequences thereof, 34
SACRED subjects, great difficulty of treating them poetically, 46
Santiago, St., happy effect of, produced in the Spanish army by a pretended appearance of, 160; numerous pilgrimages to, ibid.; origin of the order of, 161
Satirist, remark respecting the, 220; its attack on a certain lady's character in, ibid.; another article in, 221; observation of the editors of the Antijacobin respecting, 222
Saxon and Norman architecture, difference between, 135
Scott, Mr., description of his grotto at Amwell, Herts, 198; observation of Dr. Johnson respecting, 199
Scott, Sir W., act brought into Parliament by him respecting the residence of the clergy, 435
Scriptures, rules for the proper understanding of them, 247; rules necessary to be observed in order to form a correct system of principles from them, 249
Sementini, Dr., his essay on the fiery performances of Senor Lionetto, 366
Seyer, Rev. Samuel, his treatise on the modern use of the Latin tongue, 209; expediency of an English Latin dictionary for that purpose, ibid.; specimen of a nomenclature in support of his hypothesis, 210
Shaftesbury, Earl of, his seat at Cranbourn, 101; inscriptions on the tombs of former earls of that family, 102, 103
Skelton, Rev. Philip, character of his works, 165; his sermons on the means of attaining happiness in the marriage state, ibid.; his animadversions on a book of Bishop Hoadley, 167; merits of his works, ibid.
Slander, on the vice of, 96
Smith, Mr., remarks on his essays on the first principles of Christianity, 246; his talents considered, ibid.; division of the work, ibid.; first part, ibid.; second part, 247; his doctrine of divine election, 250; on the doctrines of Calvin, 251; on the presbyterian standard, 253; author's method of explaining scriptural terms, ibid.; object and probable success of the work, 254; errors of the author, 257
Smith, Dr., his talents, 397; his introduction to botany, ibid.; division of the work, 400; curious observations of, on the secretions of plants, 402; on the nature of the roots of trees, 403; merit of the work, 406
Social union among men, one of the principal objects of, described, 116
Soldier, miraculous tale of one, 13
Southey, Mr., his Chronicle of the Cid Rodrigo Diaz, 151; admirable remarks on the effects of treason and appeals to an enemy, 152; his opinion as to the cause of the character

of the modern Spaniards refuted, 154; description of mahomedanism, ibid.; progress of the Moors in Spain. 156, 158; conduct and principles of the Christians, 159; his remarks on image worship in Spain, 163; works used by him in writing his observations, 164; quotation descriptive of his manner, 234; remarks on his translation, 235; his relation of the origin of the Cid Rodrigo, 236; defects of his translation, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244; description of the Almogavares or Moorish soldiers, 243; enquiry as to the age in which the Chronicle was written, 244; remarks on his appendix and the general merits of his translation, 245

Sow, remarkable properties possessed by one, 13

Spain, firm determination of Buonaparte to subjugate it, 84; necessity for the co-operation of a powerful British army there, ibid.; character of its inhabitants, 151; effect of the subjugation of that country by the Goths and Vandals, ibid.; causes which led to that event, 152; numerous saints worshipped by the Christians in, 161; honourable conduct of the British government towards, 319; conduct of the armies of, since the first arrival of French troops in that country, 429; consequences to be apprehended from the entrance of the French into the capital of, 430; great necessity of increasing the number of our forces there, ibid.

Spaniards! death or victory, observation on the expediency of disseminating the war-song so called through Spain, 307

Spanish character, fallacy of a vulgar opinion respecting in this country, 163

Stanzas of an English friend to the patriots of Spain, observation on the merits of, 418

Staphyloma, a disease of the eye, what it is, 45

Stipendiary Curates' Bill. See Perceval

St. Cyric, miraculous story of a staff of, 13

St. Paul, remark on his aversion from controversy and dissention, 87

Superstition, extraordinary effects produced by, 161; daring artifice practised upon in Spain, 162; description of, 179

Systematic arrangement, advantages of in natural history described, 36

THE Conjuror and other Tales, merits and moral tendency of, 58

The Fisher Boy, a poem, merits of, 182; subject and incidents described, ibid.; remarks on the author, 183

The History of Discoveries and Inventions, remark on the pernicious tendency of a publication so called on young minds, 312

The Contrast, a poem, 307

The Negro, a poem, interesting extract from, 308

The Artist's Assistant, utility of this publication to mechanics and others, 312

Thomas, Mr., his observations on the ophthalmia, 202; applications used by him with success in that disorder, 203; merits of the work, 204

Times, on the increasing degeneracy of, 219

Travels through Spain and Portugal, remarks on the advertisement to, 49; extract proving the gross plagiarisms contained in them, 50; reply of the editor of those travels to the charges in the Antijacobin Review, 443; exposure of the falsehoods contained in that reply, 444

Trial by jury, excellence of in criminal prosecutions, 117; alterations suggested in the adoption of it, ibid.; ineligibility of in some cases considered, 118

Tscherkassians, or Circassians, an asiatic people, described, 270; general prejudice in favour of their women, ibid.

Turton, Dr., his translation of Linné's General System of Nature, 34; his preface, 35; arrangement of the work, 37; merits of the performance, 37; specimens showing the manner in which the translation is executed, 137; his divisions of the animal kingdom, ibid.; his description of the ox genus, 139; of the musicapa or flycatcher, 140; his entomology, ibid.; his manner of describing insects, 141; merits of his work, 142; his fifth and sixth volumes, containing the vegetable kingdom, 300; his general view of the mineral kingdom, 301; specimen of his mineralogical system, 302; his remarks on the life of Linné, 303; merits of his system, 304

Types, a useful and beautiful species of prophecy when properly applied,

216; the ark of Noah considered as one, 218

Vaccination, great utility of, vindicated, 310

Valencia, geographical and topographical description of, 168; number and occupation of its inhabitants, ibid.; population of the city of, and of other towns in, 171; description of the face of the country in, 173; salubrity of the climate, 174; rapid increase of the population of, 175; moral character of its inhabitants, ibid.; description of the city of, ibid.; literary character of the inhabitants of, 176; cheapness of living there, ibid.; excellence of the inhabitants in the art of painting, 177; description of its walks, ibid.; of the water festivals, 179; exports of, ibid.; prevalence of superstition and number of the patron saints, 180; description of the marriage ceremony among its inhabitants, ibid.

Ventenat, his selection of plants, 352

Vice, on the most effectual means of resisting its power in the minds of young persons, 97

Vimiera, battle of, remark respecting, 74; probable effects of a vigorous pursuit of the enemy after, 334

Vince, professor, his Essay on Gravitation and the Edinburgh Review, 424

Viriatus, the Lusitanian chief, some account of, 108; his character vindicated from the aspersions thrown on it by the Roman writers, ibid.; his assassination and the treachery of the Roman Consul Cœpio, 109;

Unanimity, the possibility of its perfect existence among men, 86

Urban VIII., observations on the inflammatory bulls issued by him to provoke the Irish to rebellion, 376

Uwins, Dr., his history of modern medicine, 293; the author's opinion respecting system and experience, 294; his remarks on the cause and treatment of apoplexies, ibid.; observations of the reviewers on his doctrine, 295; on the connexion of chemical with physiological science, 297; of purgatives, ibid.; strictures on the gastric and intestinal rage, 298; his inconsistency, ibid.; author's merits, 299, 300

WANOSTROCHT, N., utility to travellers of his "Petit Tableau ou Elémens de la Constitution, &c. de Grand Brétagne et d'Irlande," 422

Wardrop, J., essays on the morbid anatomy of the human eye, 38; their object, ibid.; purport and tendency of his classification, ibid.; contents of the different chapters described, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45; objections to some of his principles, 42; excellence of the plates in the work, 46; merits of the performance, ibid.

Wellesley, Sir Arthur, on his conduct with relation to the preliminary suspension of arms in Portugal, 75; an authority assumed by him which he did not possess, 76; singular character of the sixth article of the suspension, 77; vindication of his military talents, 317; happy effects which would have ensued if his advice had been taken after the battle of Vimiera, 424

Wellesley, Marquis, and Lord Melville, their talents as statesmen, 428

Welsh, their character in the days of Archbishop Baldwin, 127; their great hospitality, 128; their skill in music and poetry, 130

Whitaker, Mr., interesting sketch of his life, 529; his various works and publications, 530; his disinterestedness and magnanimity, 531; his sermons, 532; his political principles and influence, 533; his poetry, ibid.

Wife, extravagant price paid for one, 269

Wilkinson, Mr., his translation of a history of Mount Caucasus, 258; his advertisement descriptive of the difficulties opposed to the project of a Russian or French expedition to British India, ibid.; merits of the work, 271

Wisigoths, their barbarous treatment of the Jews and slaves in Spain, 153

Wollaston, remarkable observation of, to a Dissenter, 218

Woman, beautiful eulogium on, 188

Woodlands, on the policy of cultivating, 356

Worship, necessity of a right mode of, 214

Table of Contents.

TABLE OF THE TITLES, AUTHORS' NAMES, &c., OF THE PUBLICATIONS REVIEWED, AND OF THE ESSAYS, LETTERS, POETRY, &c., IN THE MISCELLANEOUS PART OF THIS VOLUME.

For remarkable Passages, see the General Index.

ACCUM's Manual of Analytical Mineralogy, 309

A Collection of modern and contemporary Voyages and Travels, 422

Acte d'Accusation de Georges, Pichegru, Moreau, &c. 368

Amicus Ecclesiæ on the Stipendiary Curate's Bill, 433

Ancient Ballads selected from Percy's Collection, 57

Angus's Introduction to Fulton's Dictionary, 206

Antiquarian and Topographical Cabinet, Vol. 3, 198

Artist's Assistant, 312

A Sermon adapted to a Country Congregation, 417

A Short Account of the late Mr. Richard Porson, M. A. Greek Professor of Trinity College, Cambridge, 419

Authenticity of St. Matthew's Gospel, 440

BARROW's Account of the public Life of Earl Macartney, 337

Bentham on Scotch Reform, 113

Bishop Milner's Letter, with others in Reply, 491, 500, 504, 508, 513, 517, 522

Blair's easy Grammar of Natural and Experimental Philosophy, 59

Blake's Designs to Blair's Grave, 225

Bland's Edwy and Elgiva, 142

Bosveld Verklaring van Paulus, 367

Britton's Catalogue Raisoné of the Cleveland Gallery, 199

Britton's Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain displayed, 419

CANDIDUS on Satire, 219

Carey's Learning better than House or Land, 311

Chapman's Skelton's Sermons, 163

Collins's Ready Reckoner in Miniature, 211

Corruption and Intolerance by an Irishman, 308

Critical Review, on French Politics and Theology, 60

Crosby's Merchant's and Tradesman's Pocket Dictionary, 212

Curwen's Hints on the Economy of feeding Stock and bettering the Condition of the Poor, 358

D'ESCURY Carminum fasciculus alter, 369

ENFIELD's general Pronouncing Dictionary, 59

Essay addressed to Medical Students, 202

Essays on Christianity, 246

FASHIONABLE Biography, public Characters, 271

Fischer's Picture of Valencia, 167

Fortune's National Life Annuities, 423

GOOD's Anniversary Oration before the Medical Society of London, 423

Grahame's Siege of Copenhagen, 183

Graham's Sermon on Female Benefit Societies, 414

Gurney's Report of the Trial, Boringdon v. Paget, 212

HISTORY of Discoveries and Inventions, 312

Hoare's Translation of the Itinerary of Archbishop Baldwin through Wales, A. D. LXXXVIII, 1, 120

Hoare's Shipwreck of St. Paul: a Seatonian Prize Poem, 46

Hodgson's Discourse on the Being and Existence of God, 206

Home, a Poem, 185

Howard's English and Greek Vocabulary, 310

Hudson and Dougall's Cabinet of the Arts, 195

JEU d'Esprit on the Meeting at Erfurth, 224

Joyce's Practical Arithmetic, 205

IRWIN's Ode to Iberia, 417

Isle of the Ocean, a Poem, 535

LAFORGUE de la Semiologie buccale, 368

Lanigan's Declaration, 499

Lenoir's Ode pindarique, 57

Lenoir's Logographic emblematical French Spelling Book, 204

Letter from the Editor of the fabricated "Travels in Spain," 443

Libel: Sir John Carr against Hood and Sharpe, 19

Little Thumb and the Ogre, 58

MALCOLM's Anecdotes of the Manners and Customs of London during the Eighteenth Century, 407

Mavor's Circle of the Arts and Sciences, 58

Mayne's Siller Gun, 304

Memoirs of the National Institute of France, 349

Table of Contents.

Memoirs of Marshal de Tessé, 363
——— ———of Mr. Whitaker, 529
Milner's Examination of the Articles in the Antijacobin Review on the Catholic Question, 368
Morton's Visitation Sermon preached at St. Paul's Bedford, 53
Mr. Perceval's Letter to Dr. Mansel, 433
Mr. Pickering's Speech on the Embargo Act and the English Orders in Council, 360
Murray's Answer to Highmore's Objections to the Bill against Small-pox Inoculation, 310
Mr. Perceval's Letter to Dr. Mansel, 390
NERI'S Hour of Trial, 192
OLD Nick's Pocket Book, 311
On Slander, 96
On Crim. Con. Trials and Oaths, 99
On the Growth of Schism, 333
Original Poetry by a Cantab, 308
Owen's Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex, 413
Owen's Sermon at Fulham Church in Reference to certain recent Occurrences among the Youths of that Parish and Vicinity, 417
Pinder Minimus's Little Odes to great Folks, 351
Piper's Christian Liberty advocated, 55
Pitman's Excerpta ex variis Romanis Poetis, 204
Plan for editing an English Dictionary under the Direction of a Society, 98
Politics, 424
Portugal, Spain, and America (politics) 313
Pott's religious Education as it constitutes one Branch of the Discipline of the Church of England, 27
Pratt's Contrast, 307
REMARKS on the Trial of Duncan Campbell, Esq., of Wells, 90
Remarks on a Letter from the Editor of the fabricated "Travels in Spain," 444
Review of the political State of Europe, 213
Reviewers Reviewed, 424
Robb's God Save the King, with Additions and Alterations, 335
SEMENTINI Sull' preteso Fenomeno della Incombustibilità, 366
Seyer's Latium Redivivum, or a Treatise on the modern use of Latin, 209
Smith's Introduction to physiological and Systematical Botany, 397
Southey's Chronicle of the Cid Rodrigo Diaz, 151, 234
Spaniards! Death or Victory — Espanoles! Vencer o Morir, 307
Stanzas of an English Friend to the Patriots of Spain, 418
State Trial of John Bull, 313
Strictures on the Convention of Cintra, 74
THE Conjuror; or the Turkey and the Ring, 58
The Master Cat; or Puss in Boots, 58
The Dissenter's true Friend, 85, 327
The Contrast, including comparative Views of Britain, Spain, and France, 100
The Fisher Boy, 181
The Dissenter's true Friend, Letter II. 213
The Patriot's Dying Hour, 447
Theodore, or the Peruvians, 423
Thomas's Observations on Ophthalmia, 203
Transactions of the Academy of Nismes (concluded) 355
Travels through Spain and part of Portugal, 49
Turton's Translation of Linné's General System of Nature through the three Grand Kingdoms of Animals, Vegetables, and Minerals, 34, 137, 300
Veteranus on the Battle of Vimiera, 334
Vindex's Defence of a Country Curate, 222
Vindication of Mrs. Lee's Conduct to the Gordons, written by herself, 59
UWIN's Modern Medicine, 293
WANOSTROCHT's petit Tableau, ou Elémens de la Constitution des Lois, du Government, &c. 422
Wardrop's Essays on the Morbid Anatomy of the human Eye, 38
Wilkinson's Description of Mount Caucasus, 258

THE END OF VOLUME XXXI.

Printed by Wood and Innes,
Poppin's Court, Fleet Street.